MAR 28 1969

PRINTED BY OFFIZIN HAAG-DRUGULIN AG., LEIPZIG (GERMANY)
FOR THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
Amram, D. W., A further Example of Paronomasia on Jerusalem . 429
Bacon, B. W., The Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John 43
Baron, S., The Authenticity of the Numbers in the Historical Books of the O. T. 287
Barton, G. A., "A Bone of Him Shall not Be Broken," John 19 36. . 13
Batten, L. W., A Crisis in the History of Israel 55
Berry, G. R., Was Ezekiel in the Exile ? 83
Bertholet, A., Zum Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Opfergedankens 218
Bowen, C. R., The Fourth Gospel as Dramatic Material 292
Budde, K., Der Abschluß von Baudissin's Kyrios 204
— Zu Jesaja 8, Vers 9 und 10 423
Burrows, M., The Original Language of the Gospel of John 95
Church, W. R., The Dislocations in the Eighteenth Chapter of John . 375
D. G., Brief Note on Pseudo-Ezekiel 430
Dougherty, R. P., Sennacherib and the Walled Cities of Judah . . . 160
Finkelstein, L., Some Examples of the Maccabean Halaka 20
Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Stephen's Speech in Acts 283
Fowler, H. T., Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians 207
Frame, J. E., Paul's Idea of Deliverance 1
Fullerton, K., Double Entendre in the First Speech of Eliphaz . . . 320
Gordis, R., Note on General Conditional Sentences in Hebrew 200
— Midrash in the Prophets 417
Gordon, C. H., Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs 384
Knopf, C. S., The Optimism of Koheleth 195
Kraeling, C. H., The Fourth Gospel and Contemporary Religious Thought 140
Lyman, M. E., Hermetic Religion and the Religion of the Fourth Gospel 265
MacGregor, G. H. C., The Fourth Gospel. The Background of Christian Experience 150
Marcus, R., The Armenian Translation of Philo's Quaestiones in Genesim et Exodum 61
Margolis, M., Corrections in the Apparatus of the Book of Joshua in the larger Cambridge Septuagint 234
McCasland, S. V., The Origin of the Lord's Day 65
Meek, Th. J., The Translation of Gêr in the Hexateuch and its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis 172
Montgomery, J. A., Paronomasias on the Name Jerusalem 277
— The Year-Eponymate in the Hebrew Monarchy 311
Morgenstern, J., A Note on Genesis 5 29 306
Perry, A. M., A Judaeo-Christian Source in Luke 181
Books Received 431

Proceedings, December 30th and 31st, 1929 i
List of Members xi
List of Subscribing Libraries and Exchanges xxvi
Constitution and By-Laws xxx

PAUL'S IDEA OF DELIVERANCE[1]

J. E. FRAME
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE Christian career of the Apostle Paul covers a period of about thirty years, but it is not until he had behind him almost a score of years of Christian activity and reflection that his extant letters begin to appear. They are not essays intended for publication but pastoral writings designed to meet the specific need of the believers addressed. Definite convictions are always present, but they are intimated rather than systematically expressed; they are seen not in repose but in action; and they often appear as flashes of insight of far-reaching significance. In writings of this character, we can not expect to find a carefully balanced arrangement of religious thought; but we may hope to discover the leading ideas, even if we cannot present them in the proper perspective. To one of these religious ideas, perhaps the ruling one, it is my purpose to address myself briefly—the idea of deliverance.[2]

---

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at a meeting held in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 30, 1929.

[2] To the following investigations my obvious indebtedness should be acknowledged: A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 113ff.; G. F. Moore, *Sacrifice* (in *Ency. Bib.*), *History of Religions, II*, p. 123ff., and *Judaism*; J. H. Ropes, *Righteousness and the Righteousness of God in the Old Testament and in St. Paul*, in *J. B. L.*, XXII, p. 211ff.; W. H. P. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith*; F. C. Porter, *Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul*, in *J. B. L.*, XLI, p. 183ff.; E. F. Scott, *The Gospel and its Tributaries*; and James Moffatt, *Love in the New Testament*.

The starting point of Paul's religious thought is the conviction that he has been delivered from the bondage of sinful flesh and is under the permanent control of the Spirit of Christ. His personal religious life, to put it tersely in a triad of his own mintage, is a life of faith, hope and love. By faith, he lives in fellowship with and under the leading of a "spiritual," that is, divine Lord who is conceived not only as seated at the right hand of God or as the *praesens numen* in a company of worshipers, but also, and characteristically, as dwelling in the heart of the believer. In this intimate attachment to the immanent divine Power, designated interchangeably Christ, Lord or The Spirit, everything seems new to Paul. He is no longer at odds with God, but at peace with him. Delivered from the thraldom of human nature within and demonic and astral forces without, he is free to do what he wills, or, in other words, to do what the Divine constrains him to do. By faith, peace with God is attained at once; and in faith, love arises, for the Christ within is the embodiment of love, and Christ's love, which is God's love, creates and fosters in the believer a like love for the neighbor. And from the love that comes from faith, hope is inspired, the assured hope of complete deliverance at the Advent, when believers, conformed outwardly as well as inwardly to Christ, will be with the Lord forever.

This sense of peace and freedom, of love and hope which the Apostle enjoys is due solely to his cleaving by faith to a person, a person who had lived in the flesh, had died on a cross, but had been raised from the dead and lives by the power of God. On this, that God raised Jesus from the dead, everything else depends. It is the conviction that Jesus lives which accounts for Paul's break with the past and starts the experience and reflection which resulted in his idea of deliverance. Unfortunately, there are no letters of Paul from the earlier and major part of his Christian life. And again unfortunately, the extant letters do not disclose unambiguously his pre-Christian attitude; they do not explain that revelation or vision which convinced him that Jesus lives; nor do they permit us to trace the steps taken after the revelation by which he arrived at the mature outlook that the surviving letters substantially presuppose.

We learn that "as touching the righteousness which is in the law" he, a Pharisee, was "found blameless;" that his attachment to Christ came at a time when he was persecuting believers; that he had a vision or revelation of "Christ," "our Lord," or "His Son;" and that, in consequence thereof, he began at once, without consulting others, to preach among the Gentiles. But what "vision" or "revelation" means to him; what connotation he gave to the words "Christ," "Lord," or "Son" at the time, if he used them; and what his "gospel" that is, his interpretation of the significance of the living Jesus, actually was at the time of his initial experience, we do not know. All that we are sure of is that Paul was convinced that Jesus lives and that he preached him forthwith among the Gentiles.

After some three years of preaching and reflection, Paul went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter, one of the three intimates of Jesus and the first to be convinced that he was raised from the dead. So far as we know, Paul had never met Jesus of Nazareth. What information he had of him prior to the revelation must, we should suppose, have been gained from his fellow-Pharisees and from the believers whom he persecuted, information sufficient to lead him to approve the crucifixion and to induce him to eliminate those who were asserting that Jesus was "the Anointed" and was living, active and the only hope for Israel. What Peter and Paul talked about during this visit of a fortnight is not recorded. Paul could have learned the substance of what Jesus had done and said in his brief career from baptism to death and might have discerned, even more clearly than Peter himself, the import of the character and mission of Jesus.

Subsequent to the visit to Peter, there is an interval of about sixteen years before the first extant letter was written. During this long period, we know that Paul was preaching among the Gentiles but do not know the exact form which his gospel took. With some plausibility, we may infer from the letters that he was reflecting on the significance of his personal experience of deliverance by faith in the living Christ; that he was interpreting this experience in universal terms and connecting it with the purpose of God; that he was seeking an explanation, in the light of the divine plan, for the fact which was a difficulty not only to Jews and Greeks but also to himself, the crucifixion; that he was sensitive to the ideas which Gentile converts brought into the ecclesia along with their faith; that he had come to believe that the need of the world was a monotheism freed from all suspicion of exclusiveness, a church of God in which all are one irrespective of race, sex, or social condition, a unity of the Spirit in which both individual and collective aspirations after God are satisfied; that this need of the world could be met through the help of a divine personal agent, the Lord Jesus; that in closely associating the "one God, the Father" with the "one Lord, Jesus Christ," he was intending not to suggest a break from his ancestral religion but to indicate the way in which that religion could become universal; and that sinfulness, the obstacle to this redeemed and united humanity, could be ended by faith in that Christ whom God, in keeping with his original purpose of mercy, had sent to assume sinful flesh with a view to its riddance.

II

Paul's theory of deliverance may well have been reached before the date of the first extant epistle, but it is developed and clarified in the effort to meet the difficulties, felt by his converts, about the Law and the place and source of moral excellence. The theory, as intimated in the epistles, is in the main clear, though it is not very likely that all its component elements can be polarized. In attempting a sketch of it my direct concern is not with the provenance of the materials at his disposal but with the use he made of them.

Flesh, to Paul, is not frail humanity in contrast with God, but sinful, morally helpless, human nature in opposition to the divine Spirit. Those who are "in the flesh" (and all who are not "in the Spirit" are "in the flesh") are at enmity with God, unable to please him, and doomed to death, "death" meaning regularly not cessation of earthly existence but separation from God. Sin and flesh are interchangeable, if not quite identical terms, for the same results are ascribed to each. How this "flesh of sin," "body of sin" or "body of flesh" came to be sinful, Paul does not say. He believes in the existence of hostile, supernatural powers and is assured that Christ at his advent will make an end of them; but he does not regard sin as a demon nor does he indicate anywhere that flesh became sinful through the infection of Satan. He accepts, without explanation, the view that, with the trespass of Adam, sin came into the world, but he does not say, as we expect him to say, that Adam transgressed the command of God because of his sinful flesh. Whatever Paul's view of its origin may have been, sinfulness exists in all the descendants of Adam. Each individual is composed of what is called an Outer Man, that is, the body, flesh or members, and an Inner Man, that is, the heart, soul, mind, self, or (in the case of the believers only, and that too, rarely) spirit. In the seventh chapter of Romans it is emphasized that Sin dwells not in the Inner Man of the unbeliever but in the Outer Man, an emphasis which suggests that this dualism is not purely ethical. The sinful Outer Man makes havoc of the Inner Man, driving him to transgress the will of God and so exposing him to the consequence of sinfulness, namely death, that is, separation from God. The seat of the trouble is accordingly sinful flesh; and salvation which can come only from God through the Lord, Jesus Christ, is deliverance from "the body of this death," in short, the riddance of sinful flesh.

As regards the body, this riddance is at first potential and then at the advent actual, for at that time the believer is to have a body freed from the vestiges of sinful flesh, a body of glory conformed to that of Christ. Paul does not look forward to the immortality of the soul apart from the body, nor does he think that the present body is to survive. He does his best to forge some link between the body as at present constituted and the future "pneumatic" body, but does not succeed in making it clear whether this future body is something entirely new or whether it is the result of the continuous operation of the Spirit, a process of "pneumatization," if the word is permissible. With this redemption of the body, however conceived, the hoped-for completed deliverance is realized.

As regards the soul, it is tempting to assume, on the analogy of what happens to the body, that the renewal of the "inner man" or *nous* is thought of as a transformation from "sarkic" to "pneumatic" substance. On the other hand, this renewal may be regarded not as a quasi-physical penetration of the self by the divine Spirit, as if deification were intended, but as moral renewal prompted and fostered by that indwelling Spirit. In any case, however realistically the relation of the believer to his Lord is conceived, the human is not absorbed in the Divine; and the new life into which the man of faith enters is a life of inward fellowship in which the human is led and controlled by the Divine.

To be qualified as the deliverer, Christ assumed sinful flesh with a view to ending it; he was raised from the dead that believers, by fellowship with him, might, like him, be freed from the bondage of that flesh and, like him, live to God in a newness of life that carries with it right relations not only to God but also to men; and he is to come shortly to make the potential deliverance actual, the possession of the body of glory being the culmination of the hoped-for redemption. The death of Christ is not simply the transition to the state of exaltation or glorification. It accomplished something which is independent of man's appropriation of its benefits. By it, to use the Apostle's dramatic language, the flesh was condemned, put off, abolished or slain. How the result was achieved is less obvious than the conviction that it was achieved. It may be that Paul imagines that Christ took upon himself vicariously the flesh of Adamic posterity and ended it by his death; certain only is his assurance that the grip of flesh is broken once for all when Christ died to it; that the believer dies with Christ to sinfulness and is raised with him to a state of right relations to God that obligates and secures right relations to men; and that behind this redemption is the love of God who sent his son to assume sinful flesh that it might be ended and that believers might "become the righteousness of God in him."

God then is the sole author of this salvation. Had he not intervened, the outlook for sinners and enemies would have been hopeless. But God is not only severe but kind; not only Judge but the originator of salvation; and he exercises not only his wrath or condemnation but also his righteousness or salvation. And Paul, in the spirit of Isaiah and the Psalms, lays the stress on this righteousness of God, meaning by it both the outgoing of his salvation to believers and the status of salvation to which all men of faith have access. The positive aspect of deliverance is peace with God or right relations to him; but this condition of reconciliation or righteousness of God in Christ depends upon the riddance of sinful flesh, the negative aspect of deliverance.

Since deliverance, in its negative aspect, is the riddance of sinful flesh, the law is excluded as the instrument of salvation. God is indeed righteous and demands that men must be in the right of it religiously with him; but acceptance with him on the basis of obedience to the law is out of the question, for the law is impotent in the face of sinful flesh. It had its historical part to play in the divine plan of salvation, but its office was not to check transgressions but to increase them, bringing to consciousness man's sinfulness and his inability to keep the law, even if he would. Paul's attitude to the law as a way of salvation is apparently not the logical opposite of his distinctive conception of faith, but arises from a personal conviction that the law is of no avail for the kind of salvation that humanity needed.

Repentance is not in the power of the man in the flesh. The word accordingly is of rare occurrence in Paul's letters; and the idea seems to have no footing in his conception of deliverance. The expected correlate, forgiveness, though retained, is not adjusted deftly to the thought of salvation as deliverance. References to divine forgiveness are infrequent. The idea when expressed (—it does not appear on the surface of 1, 2 Thess., Gal., I Cor., Phil. or Phm.) is conveyed by the verbs "forgive" and "take away" (in citations, Rom. 4 7, 11 27), "not reckon" (2 Cor. 5 19), and "show favor to" (Col. 2 13; 3 13 = Eph. 4 32); and by the substantives *paresis* (Rom. 3 25) and *aphesis* (Col. 1 14 = Eph. 1 7). The notable infrequency of these direct references suggests that Paul's chief concern is not forgiveness and not relief from the feeling of moral culpability, but rather deliverance from that sinful flesh which makes inevitable repeated deflection from the will of God. A divine forgiveness of past transgressions which did not presuppose or include the abolishment of the cause of transgression would not solve the difficulty which Paul confronted. At all events, when Paul handles, in the seventh chapter of Romans, the interrelation of law, sin and flesh, he puts himself imaginatively in the plight of the typical man in the flesh which his theory requires; depicts in highly dramatic language the conflict between the Outer and Inner Man of the unbeliever; insists that the Outer Man makes the Inner Man *sarkinos* and forces him even against his will to transgress, and suggests that the responsible factor in transgressions is neither the law nor the self, but the sinful law that exists in the members; and, at the climax, lets the wretched man cry out significantly not for release from the sense of guilt, not for divine forgiveness, but for deliverance from the body of this death.

But although the Inner Man of the unbeliever is here regarded as not responsible for transgressions, and although in the sequel divine condemnation falls not on him but on sin in the flesh, nevertheless it is true that the Inner Man has transgressed the revealed will of God. These past transgressions, trespasses or sins must be forgiven; and forgiveness, so Paul is held to believe, can be granted only on the ground of the expiatory death of Christ. Since expiation is the purpose of sacrifices, and since, in a sense, the sacrificial cultus, as a whole, could be considered expiatory, it would be natural for Paul, a Jew, to interpret the death of Christ as a sacrifice to expiate sins. But sacrificial language is as infrequent in the letters of Paul as it is common in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Moreover it is applied to men as well as to Christ. Hence the sacrificial terms are used metaphorically. To explain the metaphor, attention is drawn to the theory, based on an interpretation of Isaiah 53, to the effect that the sufferings and especially the death of the righteous for the unrighteous avail to expiate transgressions. The penalty of transgression is visited upon the righteous and the sinner is cleared. Vicarious death is not a sacrifice, but it, like sacrifice, is expiatory. Hence a metaphor drawn from the cultus is apt.

This interpretation of Paul's conception of the death of Christ may be valid. The Apostle may have fused the idea of deliverance from sinful flesh, his primary concern, with the idea of forgiveness, and connected both with the death of Christ. Nevertheless, the hypothesis of vicarious expiation is not without difficulties. For example, it is striking that Paul, whose favorite author, along with the Psalmist, is Isaiah, never designates Christ as the *pais* or *doulos* of God and but once, if it is an instance, alludes to Isaiah 53 in connection with the death of Christ (Rom. 4 25). Moreover, in referring to the death of Christ, he rarely says distinctly that it is "for our sins" (Gal. 1 4, 1 Cor. 15 3, Rom. 4 25) but is content to say that Christ died or gave himself "for us." This death "for us" may be the exact equivalent of the death "for our sins" and indicate the notion of vicarious expiation. Or else this death "for us" may refer to the death which, in delivering us from sinful flesh, delivers us also from sinning; in which case it is likewise the death "for our sins." And again, it is worth noting that while forgiveness is attached to reconciliation (2 Cor. 5 19) and deliverance (Col. 1 14 = Eph. 1 7), it is not directly connected with the death of Christ.

These difficulties might be overcome, if we could decipher the meaning of the puzzling verses in the third chapter of Romans in which Paul inserts between an implied protasis ("since we are saved (justified) freely by his grace through the deliverance which is in Christ Jesus") and an apodosis ("where then is the boasting?") a relative clause, made up of eight prepositional phrases, which tells of God's setting forth Christ as a *hilasterion*, that is, an expiation (4 Macc. 17 22) or means of forgiveness (cf. Psalm 129 LXX and Sirach 32 (35) 5) — the only instance of this word or its cognates in Paul. The meaning of the passage is admittedly obscure and the time at my disposal precludes exegesis. Suffice it to observe that the death of Christ is associated directly not with the forgiveness of past acts of sin but with the righteousness of God and deliverance; that this salvation of God, operating by deliverance, is conditioned upon the death of Christ; and that the expiation or means of forgiveness is provided not by man but by God.

In short it is clear that Paul reserves a place for divine forgiveness in his idea of deliverance; it is clear that the death of Christ is linked directly with the riddance of sinful flesh and indirectly with forgiveness; but it is not clear how the idea of salvation as deliverance or redemption is related to the idea of salvation as divine forgiveness.

III

While God has done all through Christ, and boasting on man's part is excluded, there is something that man must do, if "do" is the proper verb, in order to appropriate the benefits of Christ's work of deliverance. In contemporary Judaism, repentance is the condition of divine forgiveness; in Paul faith and faith only is the human condition of the divine deliverance. This faith is difficult to describe. Its object is almost always personal, rarely God, never the Spirit, regularly Christ. Very rarely faith is a charisma, which some possess, or the quality of faithfulness; quite often it is an inward conviction, especially the belief that Jesus is Lord, that is, that God raised him from the dead; but faith in Christ, in Paul's distinctive usage, stands as the name for that intimacy with Christ which is closely akin to being in him. It is something from, through, on, or by which (but never on account of which) men are brought into fellowship with Christ and under his dominion with the result of being in the state of rightness and peace with God. Faith is a condition but not a cause. It is not something one does. It is rather an attitude or disposition of the heart or self to Christ, a receptive, if not a purely passive attitude. Doubtless, trust and confidence are involved; but the stress is laid on the quality of reliance, faithfulness, or fidelity. The life of faith is virtually the life in Christ. Once begun, it never ends, for even in the beyond it abides. By faith, the Inner Man is saved at once; and provided faith is strong, there should be no deflections from the will of the indwelling Christ.

The primary need of man, according to Paul, is religion. But religion, as his Jewish converts knew and as some of his Gentile converts had to learn, must express itself in right conduct. In Paul's vocabulary, faith is the religious, and love, almost without exception, the ethical term. The two are vitally connected, for the object of faith and the inspirer of love is Christ. Faith itself may be more passive than active, but it puts the believer in touch with a divine energy that constrains him to active love. This energy is the indwelling Christ whose character, like that of God himself, is love. It was for his obedient love, in the days on earth, that God highly exalted him and named him Kyrios. Hence contact with him in the life of faith generates love in the believer. This love is a love as Christ loves, "the law of Christ" — to use Paul's phrase. One might suppose that that man in the flesh who consented to the goodness of the law but could not keep it, when once by faith he had come under the sway of a lord superior to sin in the flesh, would henceforth keep the law, being now able to do so. But Paul is convinced that the ancestral code is established in the single word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and he seems to believe that the Christ within will cause this love to work in all discernment. This love never fails. Speaking with tongues, prophecy, and charismatic faith and gnosis will cease; but love, like faith and hope, abides in the beyond. And the greatest of these is love, for this love is of the essence of the Divine.

By faith in Christ, the believer is at peace with God and constrained to love. So far as the Inner Man is concerned, deliverance is virtually a present possession. The Outer Man however must wait in patience until the advent for the hoped-for redemption of the body. The future does not so much change as perfect the Inner Man; but it changes the Outer Man, for the potential destruction of sinful flesh is made actual and the body is transformed. Existence in the beyond is assumed for both unbelievers and believers. In some unexplained way both alike are to come before the seat of judgment; but the decision of the judge simply confirms what already is. Unbelievers continue their existence in separation from God. Believers maintain their eternal life, the life to God in Christ, with the added boon of a glorified body. The hope is neither resurrection to earth nor immortality of the soul but eternal fellowship with Christ. Hence like him, the believer must have a body not of flesh, but, to use the undefined expression, of spirit or glory. The eschatology of Paul is redemptive. It is essential to the completion of deliverance.

IV

One closing observation. The gospel, to Paul, is the power of God unto salvation, for the righteousness of God is revealed in it.

God is sovereign. Unfaith should be impossible. But the fact is that there are relatively few converts from Hellenism and fewer still from Judaism. Why, with a powerful and divine gospel, is there unfaith at all? Paul finds but one answer: whatever is in result must also have been the original purpose of the Almighty. And into the plan of God he puts believers and unbelievers, "the saved" and "the destroyed," as he calls them. On the one hand, there is faith; the believers then need not be anxious for the outcome, for "God appointed them not unto wrath but unto the obtaining of salvation." On the other hand, there is unfaith; but this result must likewise have been the divine intent. To put it sharply: "God has mercy on whom he wills, and whom he wills he hardens." But Paul's idea of predestination, as Professor George F. Moore (History of Religions II, 134) remarks, "is not the determinist corollary of an idea of God which asserts for him a causality so absolute as to leave no place for finite free will; it is his solution of the problem. Why, when the gospel is so convincing, do not all men believe?" Indeed, this very Paul, who views the world in the shortened perspective of an imminent advent, and believes that "God hath shut up all unto disobedience that he might have mercy on all," cannot but feel that somehow ultimate unfaith is impossible. He hints at the mysterious outcome but does not explain it. The Gentiles will have faith; their faith will provoke his kinsmen to faith; and so all Israel, provoked by jealousy to faith, will be saved. His words are: "I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved." Paul ends, as he begins, with the Sovereign God whose nature is love and whose purpose is deliverance.

"A BONE OF HIM SHALL NOT BE BROKEN," JOHN 19_{36}

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

For some of us the origins of institutions, customs, ideas, and sayings have a great fascination. We recognize that the value of an institution or of an idea depends not upon its origin, but upon its function; nevertheless the study of origins continues to exercise its charm. For this reason, when, in working through the Pyramid Texts of Egypt in the hieroglyphic, I came, some weeks ago, in a passage which describes the heavenly life of Pepi II, upon the line: *n ḥśb ḳś m nfr-kꜣ-rʿ*: "Not broken is a bone of Pepi II,"[1] it at once reminded me of the Old Testament words applied by the author of the Fourth Gospel to Jesus: Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ, "A bone of him shall not be broken." The expressions are so nearly alike that the similarity is startling. It makes one wonder whether there can be any possible connection. In all parts of the world peoples in an early stage of culture have believed there was some intimate connection between the bones of a person and his inner life. Thus among the Iroquois Indians there seems to have been a philological connection between the words *esken*, "bone" and *atisken*, "soul;"[2] among certain Australians the spirit of the dead does not restfully return to its totem until the flesh has decayed from the body, left to rot on a tree platform, after which the arm-bone is broken by various complicated ceremonies.[3] In parts of Africa they seek to disable the spirit of a dead man by beating the corpse until every bone is broken.[2] The survival of this point of view is found in many parts of the world, as, for example, in the bone of the Buddha, which, originally carried from India, was received by the emperor of China into his palace with great honor in the year 810 A. D. It was placed in a monastery and exhibited to the populace once in thirty years, and was supposed to have a beneficial influence upon the crops.[4] The reverence of Christians for bones of saints, from the days of Lucilla a wealthy Spanish lady living at Carthage, 300–320 A. D. who habitually kissed a martyr's bone before partaking of the Eucharist,[5] to that of contemporary Roman Catholicism, is well known. That similar beliefs prevailed in ancient Israel is shown by the story of the dead man, who was, in an emergency, thrown into the tomb of Elisha, and who came to life when he touched Elisha's bones, (2 Kings 13 21). The observation that the bones of Jesus, or of an Egyptian king, were not broken, can, however, be but remotely connected with this widespread belief. To ascertain possible influences, one should study each case and its antecedents separately.

---

[1] See Kurt Sethe, *Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte*, II, Leipzig, 1910, § 1043b, p. 82.

[2] See "Bones" by H. Wheeler Robinson, in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, II, 791ff.

The *crurafragium*, which the Fourth Gospel says that Jesus escaped by his premature death, was originally a cruel primitive capital punishment designed for slaves and freedmen. While most of the references to it in ancient authors imply that the legs only were broken,[6] Lactantius refers to it as the breaking of bones (*ossa suffringere*),[7] so that perhaps at other times other bones were

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, London, 1904, pp. 530—546.

[4] H. A. Giles, *Confucianism and its Rivals*, London, 1915, p. 212.

[5] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, III, p. 751. It is thought Lucilla was a Donatist.

[6] Keim has collected numerous references to it; *Jesus of Nazara*, (English), Vol. VI, p. 253 n 3.

[7] *Institutes*, 4, 26.

broken as well. Many commentators think[8] that the Scripture which was, according to the Fourth Gospel, fulfilled by this, is Ex. 12 46, which lays down as one of the regulations for the eating of the paschal lamb וְעֶצֶם לֹא תִשְׁבְּרוּ בוֹ׃, which the LXX render: *καὶ ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*: "A bone of him ye shall not break." Exactly the same Hebrew phrase is found in Numbers 9 12, except that the verb is in the 3rd person (וְעֶצֶם לֹא יִשְׁבְּרוּ בוֹ) rendered by the LXX, Κ*αὶ ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψουσιν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*. "A bone of him they shall not break." The passive form of the verb in the Fourth Gospel's quotation is more nearly matched by the LXX translation of Psalm 34 20:

> *Κύριος φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτῶν,*
> *ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ συντριβήσεται.*
> "The Lord keeps all their bones,
> One of them shall not be broken."

B. Weiss[9] believed that it was this quotation which the Evangelist had in mind. The shorter form of the quotation in St. John, together with the fact that in the phrases from Exodus and Numbers the word *ὀστοῦν* occurs in the singular in immediate connection with the verb, makes it probable that interpreters who regarded the quotation as from the Pentateuch have been right. The reference in the mind of the Evangelist, then, was to the Paschal Lamb. It is easier to suppose that, when quoting, he changed the number and voice of the verb, than to suppose that he made the more extensive changes which have to be presupposed if we regard the Psalm as the original of which he was thinking.

Thus the late Archbishop Bernard wrote of the quotation: "Psalm 34 20..., although there are verbal similarities, is not apposite to the context. The Passover lamb of the ancient ritual was not only slain to provide a commemorative meal; it was an 'oblation' (Num. 9 12), and it must not be mutilated. The offering must be perfect."[10] Here speaks the Biblical theologian, whose thought is satisfied with the immediate Old Testament interpretations and associations of a New Testament writer. If, however, we grant that perhaps Provost Bernard has rightly divined the reason which led the Evangelist to make the quotation, though, to the present writer, that seems doubtful,[11] is it probable that such a motive influenced the priestly lawgiver? To break the bones of the Passover lamb after it was slain, would mar its perfection no more than to cut up and eat its flesh. This interpretation misses the whole point of the Old Testament prohibition. To break the bones of the lamb after death, could have nothing to do with the physical perfection of the lamb before death. Clearly the origin of the prohibition must be sought elsewhere.

---

[8] So Meyer, Keil, Godet, and Bernard. The last mentioned is cited below.

[9] *Johannes-Evangelium*, 8. Aufl., in Meyer's *Kommentar*, Göttingen, 1893, p. 602.

Professor W. Robertson Smith offered a better explanation. He regarded the Passover ritual as a modification of the older Semitic ritual, which was still practised by the Arabs in the time of Nilus. Nilus related[12] how the Arabs tied the chosen camel to a rude altar made of stones, how the leader marched at the head of the procession of worshippers thrice around the altar as they joined in a chant; how, with the last words of the chant, he inflicted a wound and hastily drank the blood that gushed forth; how the others then fell upon the camel and with their swords hacked off pieces of the quivering flesh and ate it raw; and how, in the brief interval between the rise of the morning star and the disappearance of its rays before the rising sun, they devoured the whole animal, meat, blood, skin, and bones. Smith[13] finds analogies between this ritual and the Passover, in that the Passover must be eaten in haste and nothing of it left until the morning. The Hebrews, however, had ceased to eat raw flesh. When this occurred the blood and bones came to be regarded as the real seat of life and the true *res sacra-*

---

[10] "Gospel according to St. John" in the *International Critical Commentary*, 1929, p. 651.

[11] Probably all that was in the mind of the Evangelist was simply that here was a fulfilment of the words of Old Testament Scripture.

[12] *Nili opera quaedam nondum edita, Paris,* 1639, pp. 27, 28.

[13] *Religion of the Semites,* 3rd ed., pp. 338 and 345; especially 345n.

menti. In this understanding of these features of the Passover ritual Baentsch[14] concurs, and, in the judgment of the present writer, it gives the true origin of the prohibition concerning the breaking of bones. Could we push further back to an earlier time in Semitic heathenism, it is altogether probable that we should find, not a camel, but a human victim devoured in a ritual similar to that described by Nilus.

The quotation in the Fourth Gospel is a remote echo of a custom which originated in remote Semitic cannibalism — an echo so remote that it was transmuted and transfigured into a simple fulfilment of the sacred words of prophecy, but still an echo.

If, now, we turn to the passage in the Pyramid Texts which provoked our investigation, the whole section reads: *n šwꜣ nfr-ḳꜣ-rʿ n kꜣ ʿntw-f n ḥśb ḳs m nfr-kꜣ-r:*' "Pepi II is not fading away (or rotting); his nails are not growing; not broken is a bone of Pepi II." The allusion is clearly to two ways in which dead bodies were disposed of. They might be buried and fade away or decay, in which case, as may sometimes be seen when corpses are exhumed, the hair and nails may grow longer; the other process was cannibalism — a process in which the flesh was consumed and the bones split up for the sake of extracting the marrow. It is not suggested that the Egyptians were cannibals at the time the Pyramid texts were written, but there are passages in them which clearly could never have been written by a people whose inheritance contained no traditions of cannibalism. This is shown by the famous passage, Pyramid Texts, §§ 400—414, beginning: "King Unis is one who eats men; he lives on gods" and contains a description of how they are cooked for him, and how their spirits and souls have entered into Unis.[15] The description is that of a cannibalistic sacrament, by means of which Unis (the same is also said of king Teti) became possessor of the bravery, courage, and strength of warriors and gods. Archaeological evidence of the kind of cannibalism here presupposed has been found at at least two points in Egypt, at Naqada[16] and in the neighborhood of the Fayum.[17] The archaeologists who describe it call it ritualistic dismemberment" — a euphemism for the more revolting word. Memory of this early feature of Egyptian ritual also survives in the *Book of the Dead*. ch. CXXV. In the portion of it known as the "Negative Confession," where the departed soul greets forty-two different deities, applying to each a descriptive phrase, and declares to each that he has not committed a certain sin, the fourth deity is addressed as "O thou who swallowest shades,"[18] (*yy ʿm šwtw*[19]). True, the word for "shades" means "shadows," so that it is not certain that it means departed spirits, though the English suggests that. As the departed one is directed to protest to the god so addressed: "I am not a thief,"[18] (*n tȝwy*[19]), probably the "shades" are the shades of night which conceal the thief. The case is different, however, with the ninth deity, who is addressed as "O thou breaker of bones,"[18] (*yy sd ksw*[19]) – a phrase which clearly harks back to the cannibalism of the early time.

---

[14] "Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri" in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament,* 1903, p. 108. Holzinger apparently traces it to a similar source; see his "Exodus" in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament,* p. 40.

[15] The original text is published in Sethe's *Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte,* already cited, Vol. I, p. 209ff. Translations may be found in L. Speleers' *Les Textes des Pyramides Egyptiennes,* Bruxelles, 1923, p. 30, and in Breasted's *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt,* New York, 1912, pp. 127ff.

In the light of all this there can be no doubt but that the words of the Pyramid text, which provoked this investigation, "Not broken is a bone of Pepi II," refer to his escape from cannibalism. The main purpose of the Pyramid Texts is to describe the ascent of the departed Pharaoh as a god to the sky, where he takes his place with the other gods. This he could not do, if his body rotted in the grave, or if it were dismembered by the breaking of its bones.

---

[16] See W. F. M. Petrie and J. E. Quibell, *Naqada and Balas*, London, 1896, p. 32.

[17] Cf. Petrie, Wainwright, and Mackay, *The Labyrinth, Girzeh and Manghuneh*, London, 1912, pp. 8—15.

[18] For an English translation see, E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of the Dead*, London, 1898, Vol. II, p. 193ff.

[19] For the text see E. A. W. Budge, *The Chapters of Coming Forth by Day or the Theban Recension of the Book of the Dead*, London, 1910, Vol. II, p. 124.

We have thus traced back the origin, both of the words of the ancient Egyptian text and of those in the Fourth Gospel, to similar primitive sacramental conceptions. The Egyptian texts, written in the third millennium before our era, lie very near this primitive font of thought. The line of ancestry of those in the Fourth Gospel is long, but not devious. While they have altogether lost their primitive meaning, and are employed to express quite a different kind of thought, their ancestry is not doubtful. The astonishing thing is that a Christian Jew at the end of the first century A. D., interpreting Christianity to the philosophical thought of the Hellenistic world, should have employed words so like those of the ancient Egyptian, and which originated long before in conditions of thought once so similar to his.

SOME EXAMPLES OF THE MACCABEAN HALAKA

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN
JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

THE great and inspiring efforts of talmudic scholars from Geiger till our own day have not sufficed to reconstruct completely the ancient Maccabean halaka. The early, pre-tannaitic teachers and judges did not usually crystallize their opinions into easily remembered maxims, they rather left them to be preserved as fluid custom and vaguely determined precedent. Only in the schools of Shammai and Hillel did the process of reducing the Unwritten Law to fixed, memorized statements become general.[1] And while we know that the mishnaic norms contain laws much older than themselves, the recency of the formulation effectually prevents us from determining the antiquity of the idea.

Our difficulties are increased by the form in which the tannaitic traditions have come down to us. Only rarely do we have the earliest norms in their original state; usually they have suffered alterations and additions which cannot always be separated by critical analysis. Scholars like Hoffmann and Ginzberg[2] have succeeded in distinguishing the original bases of some treatises, but in many instances the old and the new are so inextricably intertwined as to defy analysis.

---

[1] In several instances such as *Mishnah Pesahim* 1, 1; *Mishnah Erubin* 1, 1 the disagreement between the schools of Shammai and Hillel appears to depend on differences of interpretation of older Halakic statements, which had already been formulated. But in general it may be said that the oldest sections of the Mishnah have been traced back no earlier than the first century of the Christian Era, and apparently come from the Shammaitic School. See Hoffmann, *Die Erste Mischna*, pp. 19ff., and Ginzberg in *Hoffmann-Festschrift*, pp. 31ff.

But we can sometimes derive help in fixing the date of a law by a comparison of the rabbinic halaka with the legal references in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. True these works were composed not by scholars or legalists, but by sectarians and propagandists, and they were intended not for school study but as popular reading. Hence their statements are not always absolutely accurate, and their authors may even have distorted the extant traditions when that suited their purposes. Yet having before us the rabbinic formulation of a law, as well as the sectarian citation, we are sometimes able to make allowance for the necessary effects of time on the one source, and the conscious schismatic distortion of the other, and thus reconstruct the original with some approach to probability. We propose to utilize this method in attempting to establish the Maccabean form of the following halakas: (1) the Noachic laws; (2) the sabbath law; (3) the law of tithes; (4) the temple regulations regarding priestly ablutions and regarding the preparation of the holy incense. The first three are interesting because of their political-economic implications, the last as an illustration of early Maccabean hermeneutics.

I. The Noachic Laws

According to a *baraita*,[3] cited in several rabbinic sources, the sons of Noah received the following commandments: (1) to establish a system of civil law,[4] (2) not to blaspheme, (3) not to

[2] Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, I (1919), 33ff.

[3] *Tosefta Aboda Zara* 8, 4 (Zuckermandel, 473) and *B. Sanhedrin* 56a.

[4] Guttmann (*Das Judentum u. seine Umwelt*, p. 100, note 1) accepting the interpretation put upon the expression *dinim* by the *Tosefta* (*loc. cit.*), assumes that the Noachic law required the Gentiles to establish courts. This interpretation underlies the description of the commandment in *Pesikta of R. Kahana, Piska 12*, ed. Buber 100b. It is also adopted by Maimonides in his Yad (*hilkot melakim* 9, 14). But in spite of this support it cannot be accepted. The natural expression for a commandment to "appoint judges"

worship idols, (4) not to commit murder, (5) not to commit robbery, (6) not to transgress the laws of chastity, (7) and not to eat the flesh that has been torn from an animal while still alive.

Several writers[5] have endeavored to find a similarity between this tradition and the record contained in the Book of Jubilees, according to which Noah exhorted "his sons (1) to observe righteousness, (2) to cover the shame of their flesh, (3) to bless their Creator, (4) to honor father and mother, (5) to love their neighbor, (6) and to guard themselves against fornication and uncleanness and all iniquity."[6]

Placed side by side in this manner, the two lists may appear to have little in common and the reader may wonder at the readiness of scholars to see in them a fundamental identity. But closer study will show their intimate relationship and also the reasons for their divergence.

We must bear in mind, before proceeding with the study of the texts before us, that the Book of Jubilees which claims for itself Mosaic authorship, was written by a Jew, of Pharisaic leanings, about the year 100 B. C., in order to effect certain purposes of his own. One of these was apparently to bring about greater harmony between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. By announcing the discovery of a document giving Mosaic authority for several distinctly Pharisaic teachings and declaring that they

---

would be not *dayyanim* as *Pesikta* reads, and certainly not *dinim* as the older sources as well as the Babylonian Talmud reads, but *lehaᶜamid dayyanim*. Clearly the interpretation arose when the original significance of the Noachic laws had been forgotten, and it seemed peculiar that the Gentiles should be asked to observe Jewish civil law. But when we recall that the Noachic laws were established for the Maccabean state, we can readly see why the provision was necessary. The objection that *dinim*, interpreted as the civil code is not a single law but a whole group of them, is hardly to be regarded. In the same manner *gillui ʿarayot*, the prohibition of illicit sex relations, implies a number of separate injunctions and yet for the purposes of the Noachic code it is treated as one law.

[5] Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews V*, 193, note 67; Guttmann, *Das Judentum u. seine Umwelt*, 103; Finkelstein, *Harvard Theological Review*, XVI, 59ff.

[6] Jubilees 3 21.

had been discovered in a secret document after being hidden for many centuries, this writer imagined he could persuade all groups to unite on a common platform.[7] A second, and incidental purpose, was to strengthen certain institutions for which he had great respect and to denounce objectionable practices. The author, who does not hesitate to attribute his words to Moses, has sufficient daring to cite biblical verses with slight alterations in order to achieve his ends. It is our belief that in formulating the "exhortations" of Noah to his sons, he quoted the widely recognized "commandments of the sons of Noah" in order to emphasize certain favorite teachings.

If we suppose that the Noachic commandments had already been formulated in his day, some of the difficulties about his "exhortations" readily dissolve. His command "to observe righteousness" in its present context is quite meaningless; everything that follows is included under "righteousness." The words become significant if we suppose them to be translated from an original Hebrew, *lishmor et ha-din*, "to observe the civil law," and therefore to correspond exactly to the Talmudic first Noachic commandment, *dinim*, the establishment of civil law.

The third commandment, "to bless their Creator," is likewise peculiarly expressed; we would expect a term more like "to worship," representing an original Hebrew, *laᶜabod*, the normal term used in this connection.[8] A commandment, "to bless the Creator," is unnatural unless it is supplemented by an explanation of the occasion for blessing Him, as in Deut. 8 10, where we read: "And thou shalt eat, and be satisfied, and shalt bless the Lord, thy God, for the goodly land which he hath given thee."

In its present context the expression apparently replaces the words *birkat ha-shem* "blessing the Name" the euphemism used in the Hebrew of the Noachic laws to express the prohibition of blasphemy. The ancient Jew could not couple the name of God with a curse, even in a negative commandment, and so he regularly substituted for the word "curse," its opposite, "bless." The

[7] Comp. *Harvard Theological Review*, XXII (1929), p. 246.

[8] Comp. e. g. Deut. 11 13 *et al.*

writer of the Book of Jubilees had no occasion to warn his Jewish readers against blasphemy, but he did want to urge them to "bless their Creator;" and apparently he deliberately took advantage of this use of *birkat ha-shem* in the Noachic laws, to give it positive significance.

The prohibition of unchastity is the same in both lists.

The readers of the Book of Jubilees were in no danger of becoming gross criminals. The author therefore omitted the Noachic commands against murder and robbery, substituting for them the positive ethical injunctions to respect one's parents and love one's neighbor. The one is taken from the third of the ten commandments, the other is a positive expression of the tenth, not to covet the goods of one's neighbor.

Similarly a prohibition of idolatry would have been superfluous in this work, although it had its natural place in the original Noachic laws. The writer puts in its stead a commandment "to cover the shame of the flesh,"—an obvious attack on the custom among the youths of Jerusalem to disport themselves naked in the gymnasium, in complete disregard of older Semitic modesty. The Hellenistic gymnasium, as the author implies, exercised on the Jewish youth of the Greek period the same assimilatory influence that the Canaanite worship had exercised on their ancestors of the first commonwealth.

The Book of Jubilees enumerates only six Noachic "exhortations," but the seventh, kindness to animals, is discussed separately in the following verses. Apparently in the author's day, the commandment not to eat animal flesh before slaughter, was not part of the traditional Noachic laws. The Talmud may have reference to this stage in its statement: "six were given to Adam, and the seventh, that against ill-treating animals, was given to Noah."[9] In their characteristic way the rabbis project the growth of the Noachic laws back from Maccabean times to those of Adam and Noah.

The foregoing analysis leads to the conclusion that the Noachic laws were formulated at the beginning of the Maccabean period.

---

[9] *Bereshit R.* 16 (ed. Theodor, p. 149); *Pesikta of R. Kahana, loc. cit.*

The occasion for their establishment is then clear. For the first time in four centuries, the Maccabean victory had put Jews in a position of authority in their own land. But Maccabean Palestine contained a large heathen population. Most of these gentiles lived in cities which were not under Hasmonean dominion. But even within the limited Maccabean state, there was a large percentage of them. The scholars of the day were now confronted with the problem of giving these Gentiles a constitutional status in a Jewish state. Were they to be compelled to observe the whole Torah, or any part of it? Ought they to keep the sabbath. for instance, or the dietary laws?

The answer to these questions was given in the Noachic laws. The Maccabean scholars formulated six laws, or rather groups of laws, which were to be binding on Gentiles as well as on Jews. Four of them related to the elementary relations of civil life, being such as in modern life would come within the natural purview of the state, as opposed to the church. The state had to protect its citizens against murder and robbery and the women from violence and betrayal. The civil law, too, had to be uniform for all and the Jewish tradition was naturally adopted.

Beyond this the Noachic laws demanded from the Gentile population, first, that they desist from mocking the dominant religion. The Jews were the more free to make this demand, since their foremost representative in the dispersion, Philo, declared that they were bound by their own law to offer the same minimum of respect even to idol-worship.[10] Second, the Jewish doctrine of monotheism could not tolerate the worship of idols on their soil and within their jurisdiction. In this respect monotheism must necessarily be more intolerant than polytheism; those who believe in the One God cannot permit or sanction by their silence the worship of many gods.

---

[10] Philo, *Vita Mosis*, II, 204. See also Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha*, p. 131. The same law is cited by Josephus, clearly from Philo, *Ant.* 4, 8, 10 and *Contra Apionem* 2, 33.

II. The Sabbath Law

The newly gained autonomy of the Maccabean state necessitated not only the establishment of a fixed constitutional status for the Gentile population, but also a clearer definition of some laws pertaining to Jews alone. The chief of these was the sabbath law.

The sabbath regulations of the Torah are exceedingly vague. "Work" is prohibited, but little is said of what constitutes work. Only two acts are specifically forbidden, to kindle a fire,[11] and to gather sticks.[12] But nothing is said about buying, selling, writing, weaving, building, sewing and all the industrial arts and crafts.

Some light is thrown on the matter from references to the sabbath in prophetic and hagiographical works. Amos records that in his day the Israelites would not sell grain on the sabbath or the new moon (8 5). The author of Isaiah 58 urges his hearers to desist from business on the sabbath day: "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from pursuing thy business on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight, the holy one of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor it, not doing thine own ways, nor seeking thine own business, nor speaking thine own words, Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high place of the earth and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father (58 13—14)."

Nehemiah tells us of his efforts to prevent the violation of the sabbath. He implies that some Judeans were in the habit of "treading winepresses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses, as also, wine, grapes and figs, and all manner of burdens which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day (12 15)." In order to prevent this traffic on the holy day, he commanded that gates of Jerusalem which were shut at nightfall on Friday, be kept closed throughout the sabbath. And when some of the merchants remained without the walls of Jerusalem for the whole sabbath, he threatened to take violent measures against them.

On the other hand, we discover from an incidental passage in

---

[11] Exodus 35 3.

[12] Numbers 15 32ff.

Kings that, at least in early times, riding a beast on the sabbath day was not considered wrong. When the Shunamite woman was preparing to visit the prophet, her husband innocently said to her, "Wherefore wilt thou go today, it is neither new moon nor sabbath (II Kings 4 13)," implying that if it were a festival day he might expect her to undertake the journey.

But the matter of determining what was permitted and what was not permitted, apparently gave the scholars little concern before the Maccabean age. The Jews probably did not have full authority to enforce their law. The observance of the sabbath was largely a matter of private conscience, every man desisting from his individual labor and resting as he thought proper. The only pressure was that of popular custom and public opinion, which probably changed from locality to locality, and perhaps even from generation to generation.

The establishment of a Jewish state brought a new element into the matter. The government undertook to enforce the sabbath law, together with all the other laws of the Torah. For the cornerstone of the Maccabean government was to be the Law, on behalf of which the war had been waged.[13] Under such circumstances, there could be but one law in the country, and diversities of *minhag* could be tolerated only in minor details. Moreover the government was compelled to define in concrete terms what it would regard as punishable violations of the sabbath. Would it be prepared to punish a man for transgressing Isaiah's prohibition of discussing one's business affairs on the sabbath? Would it prohibit riding a beast on the sabbath, though the Bible records that that was practised in the apparently pious Shunamite household?

The Talmud gives us very little information about the action taken by the Maccabean scholars in this matter. R. Eliezer b. Jacob (perhaps the first, who lived at the time of the Fall of the Temple) recalls a tradition that "in the time of the Greeks a man was stoned for riding a horse on the sabbath (*B. Yebamot 90b*)." He, maintaining with all the other Talmudic authorities that riding a beast is not biblically prohibited, explains this as an extraordinary measure, beyond the letter of the law. But it is difficult to agree with him that the judges who condemned the man to death took the same view. We can hardly believe that a court would execute a person for an act not legally punishable by death, merely to inspire lawbreakers with fear. Can the death of an innocent man move transgressors to fear? Would it not be far more politic, as well as infinitely more just, to inflict judgment on the wicked. Unless we are to assume that the judges of the "Greek" times were quite blind to the social effects of judicial wrong-doing we cannot accept the Talmudic theorizing as representing actual fact. Far more likely is it that the Maccabean courts[14] considered riding on a horse an offense against the biblical sabbath law and therefore made the man pay the penalty for his transgression.

---

[13] Cf. e. g. I Macc. 2 51.

This conjecture derives additional force from the statement in the Book of Jubilees (50, 12) that riding on a beast is a capital infraction of the sabbath rest.

The Talmud contains no other information about the Maccabean form of the sabbath law. But we can learn something about it from the description in the Book of Jubilees. The author of this work mentions fifteen different forms of prohibited activity, but divides them into two lists, one containing five, and the other ten, items. He says: "And the man that does any work thereon, shall die: whoever desecrates that day, (1) whoever lies with his wife, (2) or whoever says he will do something on it, (3) that he will set out on a journey thereon in regard to buying or selling, and (4) whoever draws water thereon which he has not prepared for himself on the sixth day, and (5) whoever takes up any burden to carry it out of his tent or out of his house shall die (50 $_8$)."

A few verses later, he enumerates other prohibitions: "And every man who does any work thereon, or (1) who goes on a journey, or (2) tills (his) farm, whether in his house or any other place, or (3) whoever lights a fire, or (4) rides on any beast, or (5) travels by ship on the sea, and (6) whoever strikes or kills anything or (7) slaughters a beast, or a bird, or (8) whoever catches an animal, or a bird, or a fish, or (9) whoever fasts, or (10) makes war on the sabbath, the man who does any of these things on the sabbath shall die (50 12–13)."

---

[14] The "time of the Greeks" of which the Talmud speaks must have been that of the wars between the Hasmoneans and the Syrians, as all the commentators have understood.

The puzzling division of the prohibited activities into two groups, the one containing five and the other ten members, suggests the utilization of older material. The most satisfactory explanation would seem to be that here, as in his citation of the Noachic commandments, the author employs current traditions, perhaps with slight changes to suit his needs.

Unfortunately we cannot be certain about the extent of these changes, if there were any, because the mishnaic list of thirty-nine prohibited categories of work is of much later origin. The number thirty-nine itself was disputed by some authorities.[15] And even a cursory examination of the tannaitic literature shows that there was no general agreement as to what constituted a major violation of the sabbath. Contrary to the general opinion, the tendency of talmudic law was to make the sabbath law more lenient. Many activities which the older sources called biblically prohibited, were either permitted or declared mere rabbinical prohibitions by the later authorities. Thus in spite of the prophetic support for the rule against discussing one's business on the sabbath (Is. 58 13), the rabbis maintained that there is no biblical prohibition against it.[16] They further asserted that buying and selling on the sabbath is only rabbinically prohibited.[17] They greatly extended the rule, first established in Maccabean times,[18] of setting aside the sabbath law when life is in danger.[19] Again Shammai living toward the end of Herod's reign permitted even offensive war on the sabbath,[20] but in the war against Pompey in 63 B. C., Josephus tells us, the Zealots would only strike in actual self-defense, but made no move to prevent the Romans from proceeding with their preparatory activities on the sabbath day.[21]

---

[15] According to *Mekilta* on Exodus 35 1 and *B. Sabbath* 67 b R. Judah the Patriarch was the authority for the statement that there are 39 classes of prohibited work, and that the other authorities do not necessarily agree with him. In fact *B. Sabbath* 97 b clearly indicates that most of them were of a different opinion.

[16] *Maim. Hilkot Shabbat* 6, 1; 24, 1; 4, 5.

[17] Ibid. 23, 12.

[18] 1 Macc. 2 41.

[19] *Mishnah Yoma* 8, 6, comp. Talmud *ad loc.* and Maim. *Yad, Hilkot Shabbat*, Chapter 2.

We may therefore be prepared to find that many of the activities described by the Book of Jubilees as capital offenses against the sabbath, are held by the rabbis not to be such. But that need not deter us from recognizing that the Book of Jubilees is recording the accepted halaka of its own time. With one exception, that of conjugal relations,[22] all of its prohibitions are repeated in Talmudic authorities; although most of them are reduced in status to minor, instead of major violations.

We may surmise that Maccabean scholars, pressed for a definition of the sabbath law, proceeded to enumerate from time to time, as occasion demanded, lists of prohibited classes of labor. They naturally stressed in these lists those prohibitions about which there might be some difference of opinion. Where ultimately the lenient opinion prevailed, the older record, with its more rigorous norms. appears to us antiquated and schismatic.

In the so-called Zadokite Document,[23] we have another attempt to formulate the sabbath law. In the main, as Professor Ginzberg has shown,[24] this compilation is in consonance with the Pharisaic law, and may reflect, to a large extent, the stage reached in the definition of the sabbath law at the time of its writing.

The culmination of these centuries of discussion and study is the series of thirty nine prohibited classes of labor found in our mishna

---

[20] *Sifre* Deut. 204 (ed. Friedmann, 111b) and *B. Shabbat* 19b.

[21] *Bellum*, 1, 7, 3. Compare the note of Simhoni to the Hebrew translation (Warsaw, 1923), p. 409.

[22] A recollection of the early tannaitic prohibition of marital relations on the sabbath may be found in a *baraita* preserved in *B. Ketubot* 3b, as I maintained in *Harvard Theological Review*, XVI, 48, note 3.

[23] Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I, 10ff.

[24] *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, p. 231.

(Sabbath 7, 1). Like the lists in the Book of Jubilees and the Zadokite Document, that of the Mishna does not in fact cover the whole field of prohibited sabbath labor. It can hardly be considered an Aristotelian classification, for the subdivisions that are grouped under the various heads frequently seem far more general and important than some of the items accepted as genera. Sowing and planting are considered two different categories; so are tearing and cutting apart. But extracting the juices of fruit, as in working a winepress, is a subdivision of threshing.[25] Some categories are so loose that considerable difference of opinion prevailed as to the place to be assigned to many minor forms of labor. The mishnaic formulation, in short, bears all the marks of being the result not of logical analysis, but of organic growth. And this strengthens our conviction that the lists in the Book of Jubilees, and perhaps also in the Zadokite Document, represent stages in its growth.

This explains many peculiar anomalies in the mishnaic law. The prohibition against buying and selling on the sabbath is omitted not because the rabbis held it to be less important than the prohibition against tying a knot, for example, but because the genius of Jewish law, in its organic development preferred to deal with concrete actions rather than abstractions. Buying and selling are legal and technical activities, the manual labor represented by them is the physical transfer of the property. This was forbidden under the category "carrying." Now it is possible to sell and buy without removing the material from its place; that is considered only a secondary prohibition, because it is an abstract, and not a concrete work. Even Nehemiah in denouncing the people who came to sell in the markets of Jerusalem on the sabbath lays particular emphasis on their carrying the burdens and lading them on the beasts.[26] The commercial traffic was technically secondary to the physical acts of removal and carrying. Hence the vehement outburst in Jeremiah 17 21 ff. against those who carry on the sabbath. And hence also the peculiar fact that carrying, mentioned last among the mishnaic classes of work, nevertheless occupies no less than half of the space devoted to the sabbath in the Talmud.[27]

---

[25] Maim. *Yad, Shabbat* 21, 12.

[26] Neh. 13 15.

In a more logically arranged compilation of the sabbath works, we should expect a division primarily into agricultural, pastoral, artisan, commercial, and household activities. But the mishnaic categories are not at all so formulated. The order accepted by the compiler is chronological; he follows the grain of wheat from its origin in the field to its destiny in the baker's oven, enumerating eleven processes that enter into the history, — ploughing, sowing, reaping, gathering into sheaves, threshing, winnowing, selecting, grinding, sifting, kneading, baking. He then takes up the development of the wool, from the time it is shorn from the sheep till it becomes a finished garment, and discovers that thirteen forms of activity are involved, including shearing, bleaching, dyeing, spinning, weaving, tyeing, loosening, sewing and cutting; he then turns to the process of writing, and enumerates nine activities under that head, among them capturing a deer, slaughtering it, tanning its hide, writing upon the parchment, erasing so as to be able to write more correctly. Finally in a miscellaneous group he mentions building, and breaking down for the purpose of rebuilding, kindling a light, extinguishing, striking the anvil and carrying from house into market place.

There is not even an attempt at logical analysis; the order followed is purely mnemonic. The compiler was not worried lest some activity be omitted. For he knew well that those not mentioned as classes find their place in subdivisions. The sabbath laws and prohibitions had been well fixed by custom in his day; only the smallest details were left for rabbinic discussion. What he sought was a convenient method of committing the most important forms of work to memory and this he provided in the list that is contained in our mishna.

III. The Law of Tithes

The Biblical law of tithes, as it was interpreted in the third century B. C., weighed very heavily on the rural population of

---

[27] This includes the greater part of the treatise *Erubin*, and Chapters 1, of Sabbath.

Judaea. In addition to the Levitical law which assigned one tenth of all the produce to the tribe of Levi,[28] the Deuteronomic law[29] required that a second tenth be consumed annually in Jerusalem. The ordinary peasant thus had to pay an annual income tax of ten percent, and to spend ten percent more of his income in a few days' holiday at the capital city.

We readily surmise that so heavy a tax was evaded by many, and indeed Tobit takes great pride in having observed it. "I used to go to Jerusalem," he tells us, "with the first fruits and the firstlings and the tenth of the cattle and the first shearing of the sheep, and give them to the priests, the sons of Aaron, for the altar; and the tenth of the corn and the wine and the oil and pomegranates and the rest of the fruits to the sons of Levi, who ministered in Jerusalem; and the second tenth I tithed annually for the six years and went and spent it each year at Jerusalem; and gave it unto the orphans and the widows and the proselytes who attached themselves to the children of Israel, I brought it and gave it unto them in the third year."[30]

---

[28] Nu. 18 21.

[29] Deut. 14 22.

[30] Tobit 1 7ff. We need not concern ourselves here with the controversy between Geiger and Pineles as to whether the older halaka provided also for a "third tithe." If Geiger's thesis be admitted, the tax on the farmer was so much the greater and the need for reform so much the more pressing. But it is doubtful whether the authoritative halaka ever recognized more than two annual tithes. Geiger certainly has shown that Josephus knew of a custom to give a third tithe on the third year (Jos. *Ant.* iv, 8, 22), and possibly this third tithe is presupposed also in Tobit (the passage cited above) and in Targum Ps. Jonathan on Deut. 26 12. But these seem to represent the attitude of the most pious, not the requirements of the savants. But compare Geiger, *Urschrift*, 179ff., and in opposition, Pineles, *Darkah shel Torah*, 173ff. Olitzki in his *Flavius Josephus u. die Halacha*, Berlin, 1885, 16ff. (but see particularly p. 18, note 22) agrees with Pineles in denying that there was a third tithe. He maintains that Josephus, ignorant of the traditional law, was misled into supposing that three tithes were given on the third year, when he noticed that some of the second tithe of the second year was used in Jerusalem also on the third year. It must also be admitted that a comparison of the Sifre Mss. with the printed text, weakens Geiger's thesis. For the Sifre text (Deut. 26 17, section 72, ed. Friedmann, 89b) on which he

The power of the Maccabean government to enforce the tithe as a state law put it in a serious dilemma. It could not refuse to enforce the biblical law, and yet we can realize what difficulties presented themselves against any attempt to compel obedience to it. Both the Talmud and the Book of Jubilees record attempts to deal with this problem realistically.

The author of the Book of Jubilees boldly annuls the law of the second tithe. He maintains that the first tithe is to be given to the priests rather than to the Levites, and that the priests are to separate from their receipts a tithe, which he calls the "second tithe" to be "eaten before the Lord," in the sanctuary at Jerusalem (Jubilees 32 8 ff.). The author thus retains the name "second tithe" which in his day was used familiarly for the additional tenth separated by pious Judaeans for consumption in Jerusalem, but declares that it is not supplementary to the Levitical or Priestly tithe, but one tenth of it.

Quite a different solution to the problem is recorded in the Talmud as having been established in practise. According to its story John Hyrcan,[31] finding that many farmers did not set apart the

---

relies to show that the rabbis themselves recognized the third tithe, appears in quite a different form in the manuscript sources. I cannot enter into details here, but from the material at present available before me, I believe that the text of the baraita cited by Geiger from ed. pr. arose out of a scribal error.

[31] *Tosefta Sotah* 13, 10 (Zuckermandel, 320) and *Jer. Sotah* 9, 11 and *B. Sotah* 48a. Compare Graetz, iii, note II end (ed. Leipzig 1888, p. 686), who maintains that Hyrcan did not inaugurate the institution of *demai*, but rather enforced the collection of tithes. This view he maintains is supported by *Mishna Sotah* 9, 11 and by the comment in the Talmud of Jerusalem. The mishnah says simply: "In his days (John Hyrcan's) no one had to ask regarding *demai*." And the Talmud of Jerusalem explains that "he appointed pairs." Graetz takes that enigmatic statement to mean that he appointed pairs of overseers to compel payment of the tithe. But Graetz failed to notice that this interpretation is in absolute contradiction to the tradition recorded in Tosefta and cited by R. Johanan in the Talmud of Jerusalem (loc. cit.) that R. Johanan instituted the custom of *demai*. The reading of the *Tosefta*: "He also established the *viddui* and abolished the *demai*" makes no sense. The *viddui* must be the confession recited when

Levitical tithe, ordained that the purchaser of grain should do so, unless he was certain that it had been done by the seller. But having done so, John Hyrcan added, the purchaser was not obliged to give the separated tithe to a priest or Levite, but might use it for his own needs.

This ordinance established the well-known institution of *demai* (the name technically given in the rabbinic sources to grain bought from a farmer or merchant, without definite information as to whether the tithes have already been separated or not). Both the legal theory on which this ordinance is based, and its economic background and purposes, are well worth close attention.

John Hyrcan, acting doubtless on the advice of contemporaneous scholars, apparently held that tithing the grain involved two diverse elements, which might be separated from one another. The first was the purely ceremonial act of setting aside one tenth of the grain for holy purposes.

The second was the civil obligation to transfer the separated tithe to some Levite or priest. There was no ceremonial obligation involved in this transfer, according to John Hyrcan; the original grain which might not be eaten unless the tithes were separated, could be eaten if they were separated but not given away. And the tithe itself could also be eaten — according to purely ritual law — by any Jew, not necessarily by a priest or Levite.

But John Hyrcan went further. He now declared that after all no one could be certain that the proper tithes of any particular

bringing the second tithe to Jerusalem, but this did not have to be established by Hyrcan. It had been ordained in Scripture (Deut. 26 12ff.); nor could Hyrcan have abolished the institution of *demai* for no one maintains that it existed before him. The text must be emended so as to read that "He also established the institution of *demai* and abolished the *viddui*". The tradition that Johanan established the *demai* thus found in the Tosefta, and recorded by R. Johanan, must be accepted in preference to the ambiguous statement in the *mishna*. It is possible nevertheless to reconcile the two statements by supposing that for some time Hyrcan tried to enforce the biblical law, but having failed in that finally established the law of *demai* as a compromise.

grain had not been paid to the priests and the Levites. The burden of proof that it had not been paid rested on the shoulders of the claimants, the priests and the Levites, for the question of ownership was purely a matter of commercial law.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the owner was entitled, so far as the civil obligation was concerned, to take it for granted that the tithe had been paid to the Levite and he could proceed with an easy conscience to consume the grain which he had separated to satisfy the ritual requirement.[32]

This legalistic, almost casuistic, argument must have been worked out by the Maccabean scholars. In view of it, the ordinance of *demai* appears to be no longer a rabbinic law to prevent eating untithed grain, but a statesmanlike interpretation of the ancient law to save purchasers from the theoretical requirement of paying a tithe on bought grain.

Practically the law of *demai* nullified the institution of *maᶜaser*, so far as purchasers were concerned. Pious farmers were naturally bound to pay their tithes as before, and many of them did. But as for the majority who did not, they could sell their grain without prejudice and the buyers were relieved of any responsibility of giving away a large part of it. Furthermore, and this doubtless was even more important from the point of view of John Hyrcan, the government was freed from the responsibility of taking energetic steps toward compelling the payment of tithes. The ordinance of *demai* enabled it to call upon each purchaser to protect his own conscience without any great loss to himself.

The value of the record in the Book of Jubilees in this instance is not to bring support to the Talmudic record of the manner of establishment of *demai* as an institution; that is made sufficiently clear in rabbinic sources. But it does show how much difficulty was encountered in the observance of the law of tithes and how restive the common people were under it. The author would hardly have gone to the extent of suggesting a practical abrogation of a clear biblical law, if he had not felt that the letter of the law was beyond the willingness or the ability of most people to observe. This strengthens our *a priori* conjecture that John Hyrcan in establishing *demai* had in mind less the observance of the ritual, than the accommodation of the great mass of the people.

---

[32] See sources mentioned in previous note. The provision that the burden of proof is on the complainant applies not merely to *maᶜaser ani*, as might appear from a cursory reading of the *baraita*, but also to the first tithe.

IV. Two Temple Regulations

A. Washing the Hands

The Bible provides that before approaching the altar to perform sacrifices the priests "shall wash with water that they die not (Ex. 30 20)." When we turn to the parallel passage in the Book of Jubilees we find that the priests were expected to do much more. In the sacrificial law that Abraham gives to Isaac he says: "And at all times be clean in thy body, and wash thyself with water before thou approachest to offer on the altar, and wash thy hands and thy feet before thou drawest near to the altar, and when thou art over sacrificing, wash again thy hands and feet (21 16)."

This passage does not make clear the distinction between the first "washing" and the following "washing thy hands and thy feet." It is illuminated by a corresponding passage in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (T. L. 9 11). Where Levi is commanded: "And before entering the holy place, bathe; and when thou offerest the sacrifice, wash; and again when thou finishest the sacrifice, wash."

A comparison of both passages shows that the priests were required to bathe on entering the Temple, then to wash their hands and feet in preparation for sacrifical service, and again to wash their hands and feet at its end. This is made quite clear in the Aramaic and Greek Fragments of the Testament of Levi, which Charles considers to be the source of the law recorded both in the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. There we are told: "And when thou risest up to enter the house of God, wash thyself with water and then clothe thyself with the garment of the priesthood, and when thou art clothed, again wash thy hands and feet, before thou offer anything on the altar. And when thou takest to offer all that is fitting to offer on the altar, again wash thy hands and thy feet."[33]

This procedure, nowhere explicitly mentioned in the tannaitic literature, is nevertheless definitely implied by the description of the High Priestly ablutions on the Day of Atonement. The mishna of Yoma tells us that before entering on his duties, at dawn, the High Priest would bathe, don his golden robes of office and then wash his hands and feet in preparation for the morning sacrifice.[34] At the end of the sacrifice he would again wash his hands and feet, remove his golden robes, bathe, and then dress in linen in order to offer the incense in the Holy of Holies.[35] After this ceremony he would once more wash his hands and feet, and bathe, and again assume his golden clothes for the *musaf* service.[36] There were similar ablutions, and another change to linen clothes when, after the *musaf* service, he had to enter the Holy of Holies to remove the remnants of the incense, and finally a last change to golden clothes to offer the afternoon sacrifice. At the end of the whole day's service he would again wash his hands and feet.[37]

The rabbis of the second century, R. Meir and R. Judah were much confused regarding the need of these many bathings and washings.[38] If the High Priest was required to bathe after removing his clothes, why wash his hands and feet before removing them? Purely technical answers, based on difficult hermeneutic derivations, are offered by the Talmud, but these would hardly be acceptable, even if we lacked the clear evidence of the pseudepigraphic works regarding the origin of the custom.

In view of the information in these books, it is clear that the High Priest bathed at dawn before beginning any sacrifice, in accordance with the rule that "no one may enter the Temple court to offer sacrifice even if he be clean unless he bathe (*Mishna Yoma*, 3, 3)." This bath did not free him from the necessity of washing his hands and feet as he approached the altar, for that was required by the clear biblical statement. At the end of the service the High Priest washed his hands and feet as any other priest might, in accordance with the Pharisaic prescription preserved in the Testament of Levi and the Book of Jubilees.

---

[33] Charles, *Greek and Aramaic Fragments* in his Appendix to *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Greek Text, p. 248. Compare also his English Translation of the Testaments, p. 230.

[34] *Mishna Yoma* 3, 4.

[35] *Ibid.* 3, 5.

[36] *Ibid.* 7, 3.

[37] *Ibid.* 7, 4.

[38] *Mishna Yoma* 3, 6; *Tosefta, ibid.*, 1, 16 (p. 182); *baraita*, cited in *B. ibid.*, 32a.

Having done that, he must proceed to bathe and wash his hands and feet in preparation for the next ceremony and so on throughout the day.[39]

We can hardly expect to find any social need behind these various washings. If they are to be explained at all, we must see in them Maccabean interpretations of the Scriptural verse; the law which requires them is the first sign of the rise of the system of deriving new regulations from superfluous words. In the spirit which in later times so completely animated R. Akiba and his colleagues, these early scholars noted that the root *rahas* (to wash) occurs thrice in the passage commanding the priests to cleanse themselves before approaching the altar (Ex. 30 17 ff.). The divine book could not possibly be redundant and its repetition must be significant. And the natural interpretation which they put on the passage was a requirement of three ablutions, a bath before entering the sanctuary, washing hands and feet before the sacrifice and again after the sacrifice.

B. The Incense Offering

The law of incense offering offers a good example of the development of the halaka. For in this instance we can trace its gradual growth almost as we can follow the annual growth of a tree by the markings on its trunk. The bible requires that the incense to be offered on the altar shall consist of "sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and galbanum; sweet spices with pure frankincense (Ex. 30 34)." In addition to these four spices specified in Scripture, the Book of Jubilees names also nard, myrrh and costum (Jub. 16 24). The Talmudic baraita on the subject adds to the seven of the Book of Jubilees four others: cassia, saffron, sweet flag and cinnamon (*B. Keritot* 6*a*).[40]

---

[39] Definite proof that the washing of the hands and feet, required of the High Priest after the service and before bathing, was not preparatory to the next ceremony, but concluded the first, is to be found in the law demanding that he wash his hands and feet at the end of the whole service (*Mishna Yoma* 7, 4).

In itself it might be possible that the formula for preparing the incense was made more complicated because the priests discovered the value of the new ingredients in preparing the sweet-smelling compound. But we may well doubt whether permission would have been granted them to make these changes, much less that the Pharisees would have advocated them, had they not found biblical support for these additional elements in the repetition of the word *sammim* "spices" in the scriptural verse. The redundancy must have moved the early scholars to suppose that other spices than those mentioned were to be included in the preparation, and they might thereupon have taken the liberty of relying on their own judgment in selecting them.

Conclusion

In the examples of Maccabean law cited we have endeavored to show how the Maccabean scholars approached the task of developing the halaka. The Noachic commandments, the sabbath law, and the law of tithes offer instances of development in response to economic and political conditions; the temple regulations help us to understand the workings of the Maccabean mind where only theoretical questions were involved.

The spirit in which these laws are conceived is that of the Pharisaic scholars, but we are inclined to believe that they antedate the formation of the Pharisaic party. In reconstructing the historical situation in the early Maccabean age, in the years between the acknowledgement of Simeon's practical independence and the break between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, we doubt whether there were originally recognized party or sectarian divisions. There is no real proof of such division, and everything that has come down to us points to a harmonious working together of all elements during the reign of Simeon and the early years of John Hyrcan.[41] But the social differences which had already existed in pre-Maccabean times, and which we have discussed at length elsewhere,[42] had their influence on the attitude of the people. It would be natural that in the new state of Judea, the priestly nobility and the army officers should concern themselves mainly with diplomatic affairs and the organization of civil government, while the humbler scholars and students would busy themselves with the development of the law. At first such a division of labor might continue in harmony. The urban traders and artisans, represented in the counsels of the government by the scholarship of their sons, might be inclined to look for peace and mutual good will between the Jews and their neighbors, both those within the borders of the state, and those of the neighboring principalities. The nobility, and particularly the soldiers, intoxicated by their victory might be expected to seek the aggrandizement of their small dominions, and the complete control of the heathen population. Hence we find John Hyrcan forcibly proselytizing the Idumeans at the same time that the scholars at home were declaring only seven laws of the Torah applicable to the Gentile world.

---

[40] For a careful identification of these spices see Macht, *The Holy Incense* (Baltimore, 1928).

We can now understand why a tension developed between the great landowning and priestly aristocracy and the masses of the people. And we can also explain why the differences, hidden at first under a masque of good will, burst out in a flame when at the feast celebrating the victory of the King over the enemies of his people, someone indiscreetly spoke out the suppressed thoughts of the pacific masses.[43] Some bitter words were spoken and "the scholars of Israel" as the ancient record puts it, "separated themselves in anger." Thereafter there was a clear breach between the house of the Hasmoneans and the Pharisaic scholars. The savants were doubtless compelled to leave the Sanhedrin and the King and his advisers undertook to legislate for the internal needs of the people as well as to carry on their diplomatic affairs. The Pharisaic writers who had been praising the Hasmonean house and had looked upon the age as almost Messianic were now completely disillusioned and became a bitter and violent opposition. The struggle lasted throughout the remainder of Hyrcan's reign and continued through that of his successors, till in the time of Alexander Jannaeus it broke out into an open rebellion. With the death of Alexander and the succession of Salome, the Pharisees under Simeon b. Shetah returned to power. But now they controlled not only the internal affairs of the community but also its world policy.

---

[41] The Wellhausen theory that the antagonism between the groups became bitter as early as the days of Jonathan, cannot be maintained in view of the high praise accorded to the Hasmoneans in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Book of Jubilees. Neither of these come from Sadducean sources; and their enthusiasm for the Hasmoneans shows definitely that even toward the end of the second century B. C. the Pharisees were well-disposed toward the government.

[42] *Harvard Theological Review*, XXII, 198—199.

This reconstruction of the division between the sects seems to me more plausible than that generally offered. It accounts in a natural manner for the change of the Pharisaic attitude toward John Hyrcan, for the dramatic break between the King and the scholars, and finally is in complete harmony with what we know to have been the respective teachings of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and what we may assume to have been their social origins.

---

[43] This story is told in an ancient *baraita*, *B. Kiddushin* 66a, and also in Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6. The Talmudic record refers this incident to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. But for reasons given in *Harvard Theological Review*, XXII, 248, note 140, it seems to me that Josephus's tradition of a break between the two groups during the time of Hyrcan must be accepted.

THE ANTI-MARCIONITE PROLOGUE TO JOHN*

B. W. BACON
YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

OLDER members of this Society may recall my article presented in December 1912 and published in the Journal for Sept. 1913 (XXXII, 3) under the title „The Latin Prologues of John." This article (hereinafter cited as Art. I), together with one which I published in the *Journal of Theological Studies* in 1922 (Vol. XXIII, No. 90) under the title "Marcion, Papias, and 'The Elders'" (hereinafter cited as Art. II) demands correction and restatement in view of the recent discoveries of D. Donatien De Bruyne printed in *Revue Bénédictine* for July 1928 (XL, No. 3) under the title: "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Evangiles." The matter so deeply concerns Harnack's distinctive views regarding the origin of the four-gospel canon, as set forth in his great work published in *TuU* Vol. XLV, 1921 under the title *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, that the Society is entitled to expect this restatement.

A reliable text for the Prologue to John has now been obtained by De Bruyne's discovery of seven Latin Mss. which contain it in addition to the three previously known. On pp. 198f of his article De Bruyne prints this text with *apparatus criticus* as follows:

> Euangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus, discipulus iohannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero euangelium dictante iohanne recte. Verum Marcion hereticus, cum ab eo fuisset inprobatus eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus

---

* In part from *Studies in Mt* by B. W. Bacon (Holt and Co., 1930), Appended Note III.

> est ab iohanne. Is vero scripta uel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in ponto fuerunt.

The *apparatus criticus* shows that four of the ten Mss. (TXEY) omit *recte*. Of these T, oldest of the ten, ends the statement regarding John as author: *iohanne subdictante* (EY sibi dictante) *conscripsit*. The statement regarding Marcion then begins: *Verum Archinon hereticus* etc.

De Bruyne's text only differs as respects punctuation from that I had based in Art. I on the three Mss. then known. With Westcott, Lightfoot, and Zahn I separated the prologue into two paragraphs A and B. Then, by placing a full stop after *iohanne*, I rendered as follows:

> A. The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the churches by John while yet in the body, as one Papias of Hierapolis, a dear disciple of John, has reported in his exoteric, that is, his last five books. Indeed he took down the Gospel in writing while John dictated.
>
> B. But Marcion the heretic was justly cast out by John after having been disapproved by him because of his adverse opinions. Indeed he (Marcion) had brought to him (John) writings. or letters, from the brethren who dwelt in Pontus.

The text thus punctuated, however (that is, unless with TXEY we cancel *recte*), requires *vero* (not *verum*) *Marcion*, because the conjunction *verum* when used post-positively always takes the form *vero*. The error, therefore, of proposing to read *Recte verum Marcion* instead of *Recte vero Marcion* must be frankly acknowledged. With this correction we must reaffirm the essential points of Arts. I and II against the vigorous denials of De Bruyne.

In 1912 Clemen could still maintain (*Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums* p. 375) that the statement of Paragraph A (translated, as the phraseology proves, from a Greek original) should be accepted as in substance true.

Not, of course, that the alleged testimony of Papias could be admitted in the form reported. Lightfoot in his Essays against the author of *Supernatural Religion* (*Contemporary Review*, 1875, XXVI, 854) had conceded this to be incredible, proposing instead

> that Papias, having reported some saying of St. John on the authority of the elders, went on somewhat as follows: "and this accords with what

> we find in his own Gospel, which he gave to the churches when he was still in the body . . ."

Thus altered to a mere *obiter dictum* Lightfoot believed the testimony might have escaped the notice of the contestants over the question of the authenticity of Jn who ransacked the pages of Papias for evidence on this question, *pro* and *contra*, from 180 to 300 A. D. Indeed we should add to this third-century inspection the subsequent careful search of Eusebius, who in the early fourth century again scrutinized the five-chaptered work for evidence on the origin of the Gospels. In view of this repeated search we need not be surprised to find even Lightfoot disinclined to attach importance to the alleged fragment, even in the form conjecturally restored by himself. Clemen gives the testimony more weight. Others still remain dubious.

Art. I aimed to show that Paragraph A actually does reflect in distorted form a statement made by Papias in the fifth and last book of the *Exegeses*. It is true that while the addition of *id est in extremis*, in attempted correction of the blundering reference to *exotericis* (for *exegeticis*) *quinque libris*, is probably due to the translator, the Greek writer himself can have had no direct acquaintance with the work cited. But he probably draws from someone (Hippolytus?) who had made reference to "the fifth book of the *Exegeses* of Papias." Art. I maintained that the statement could be accepted if Papias' testimony had applied originally to the *Revelation*, not to the *Gospel* of John. For Papias' fifth book dealt with eschatology, as the citations of Irenaeus indicate. The Prologue-writer could easily take this testimony as applicable to the Gospel also.

The reasons given for this explanation were chiefly the following:

(1) We are credibly informed by Andreas of Caesarea, who elsewhere professes to quote "word for word" from Papias' book, that ,,Papias," as well as "Irenaeus, Methodius *and Hippolytus*," maintained the "credibility" (ἀξιόπιστον) of Revelation. Corroboration is available. Justin Martyr, who does not actually quote Papias but probably rests on his authority, asserts (*Dial.* lxxxi) that

> John, one of the apostles of Christ, prophesied by a revelation that was

> made to him that those who believe in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem.

In short Justin also maintains the credibility of Revelation, but agrees with his Phrygian contemporary in observing a significant silence regarding the authorship of the anonymous Gospel and Epistles. In fact the relative neglect of their testimony in Papias' time is very difficult to reconcile with the idea that for these the question of Johannine authorship had yet come into serious dispute.

But further, the "revelation to John in the Spirit" was accompanied in Rev. 1 11 by the direction to "write the vision in a book" and "give it to the churches." This is clearly the statement which Papias thought "worthy of belief" (ἀξιόπιστος); for the question whether the claim of Rev. 1 9–11 was or was not "worthy of belief" formed the very heart of the prolonged chiliastic controversy, whose origin precedes that over the authenticity of the anonymous Epistles and Gospel. Testimony of Papias to the *Revelation* of John is therefore a well attested fact; testimony from him to the *Gospel* is improbable; in the form alleged it is admittedly incredible.

(2) The phraseology quoted by the Prologue, *manifestatum* (!) *et datum ecclesiis*, applies to a "revelation" rather than a gospel. Moreover it agrees exactly with that of Rev. 1 9–11 "I John . . . was in the Spirit, and I heard a great voice saying, What thou *seest*, write in a book and send it to the seven churches." The same phraseology reappears in Justin ("prophesied by a revelation made to him"), and in an Ethiopic subscription of the London polyglot "Here is ended the Revelation of John, the Apocalypse. Amen. That is to say, the vision *which he saw in his lifetime*, etc.[1] When the Prologue adds that John fulfilled the command received by him "in the Spirit" "while yet in the body" it

---

[1] An Arabic version cited by Graf ("Arabische Übersetzungen der Apokalypse" in *Biblica* 10 (2) Apr-Jun, 1929) has the following subscription (Graf's rendering): Buch der Abogalimsis und ihre Erklärung; das ist, die Vision welche Johannes, der Sohn des Zebedaeus, einer der Zwölfe, der Evangelist, der Jungfräuliche, gesehen hat, nach dem was erklärt hat der heilige Ankulitos (*sc.* Hippolytus), der Papst von Rom.

makes no further inference than every reader of the passage necessarily makes, and is intended to make. The accepted date for the publication of the Apocalypse was "in the end of the reign of Domitian." This made the statement necessary; because publication at the age of ninety and upwards was not more common in antiquity than today.

(3) In the age of Hippolytus and Tertullian the *Instrumentum Johanneum* was a unit. For the Church at large all five of the disputed books stood or fell together. Hence if testimony could not then be adduced from Papias in behalf of the Gospel (and we have seen that none is likely to have been available) his testimony to the Revelation could be made to serve the purpose. If a Hippolytus in defending the authenticity of the Revelation against Gaius, quoted Melito, Irenaeus or Methodius; or if in his treatise *Against Marcion* he spoke of Papias as having borne witness to the "credibility" of Rev. 1 9–11 this would easily be construed by the writer of any third-century Prologue as applicable to the whole *Instrumentum Johanneum.*

Fortunately or unfortunately Paragraph A, giving the testimony of Papias, does not stand alone in the Anti-marcionite Prologue. We are more especially concerned with Paragraph B, because De Bruyne rests upon it his defence of Harnack's contention that previous to the well known conflict of Marcion with the church authorities at Rome, when after a period of great devotion beginning c. 140 A. D. he was expelled for heresy, there had been a previous experience of similar kind at Ephesus, Marcion being cast out there by "the elders." Of this the sole existing evidence is Paragraph B of the Latin Prologue.

Zahn's abrupt dismissal of the paragraph as "wholly fabulous" is not the right method of treatment, for the statement is easily traceable, as shown in my Art. I, to Tertullian's utterances about John and Marcion in his treatise *Adv. Marcionem* IV, iiif (comparing the preceding reference to II Jn 7 in III, viii), and his further utterances in *De Carn.* ii., and *Praescr.* xxx. My aim was to prove the date of the Prologue in its present form (or at least of Paragraph B) to be not earlier than the treatise *Adv. Marcionem,* written in 208 A. D. (I, i. 15). The fuller demonstration of this dependence presented in Art. II is now peremptorily rejected by De Bruyne (p. 210, "contre Bacon je rejette toute dépendance vis-à-vis de Tertullien"). The issue has sufficient importance to warrant an extract or two from my articles.

On p. 209 of Art. I, in elucidation of the clause of Paragraph B *Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat* the passage *Adv. Marc.* IV, iiif was cited as follows:

> Sed enim Marcion *nactus epistulam* . . . connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine (i. e. Jn and Mt) eduntur . . . et pecuniam in primo calore fidei catholicae ecclesiae contulit, *projectam mox cum ipso,* postquam in haeresim . . . descivit. Quid nunc si negaverint Marcionitae primam apud nos fidem eius *adversus epistulam ipsius*? Quid si nec *epistulam* agnoverint?

A few words were added to show how the prologue-writer could take the "letter," in spite of which the church "cast out" the heretic along with his money, to be a "letter of commendation" brought by Marcion from his home in Pontus. Whether this was really Tertullian's meaning is still in dispute.

Next (on p. 210) two questions were raised regarding the preceding statement of Paragraph B, that Marcion was "cast out by John" (!), with the purpose of showing how the writer had been led into this curious anachronism. The two questions were: (1) How comes the discomfiture of Marcion to be ascribed to *John*? (2) Why is his heresy referred to in such curiously mild terms as '*eo quod contraria sentiebat*'?."

The first question was answered by pointing to Tertullian's inversion of the parts. Marcion had "rejected John and Matthew, who came first instilling faith, whilst Luke and Mark renew it afterward." But, says Tertullian, it would be more proper to say "that John had rejected Marcion;" because all such docetic heresies as his are repudiated in advance by II Jn 7, where the Apostle says:

> Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the antichrist.

It is Tertullian, therefore, in *Adv. Marc.* III, viii and again in *Praescr.* xxxiii (cf. *Adv. Prax.* xxviii) who must be held primarily responsible for inverting the rôles of John and Marcion. Only, Tertullian is speaking metaphorically of a "casting out" of the heretic by prophetic foresight, whereas our Prologue-writer takes him literally. On the equivalence *ab eo* = *a iohanne* see below.

The second question was answered by pointing to two further references by Tertullian to Marcion's heresy, in which the African protagonist of the Church voices the habitual (and quite just) complaint of the orthodox that Marcion's violent rejection of the canonical Gospels in favor of his own garbled reconstruction of Lk,[2] and his accusations of interpolation by Peter's adherents of the Epistles of Paul, rested on no better evidence than "his own contrary opinion." Thus in *De Carne Christi* iii Tertullian addresses to Marcion the reproach,

> If thou hadst not rejected the Scriptures which were *contrary to thine own opinion* (opinioni tuae resistentes) the Gospel of John would have confounded thee.

Again in *Adv. Marc.* IV, vi. he writes,

> He (Marcion) has erased everything that was *contrary to his own opinion,* whilst everything that *agreed with his own opinion* he has retained (contraria quaeque sententiae suae erasit . . . competentia autem sententiae suae reservavit).

It is easy to see where our Prologue-writer gets his statement that Marcion was rejected by John "for holding contrary opinions" (eo quod contraria sentiebat).

After Harnack's extended review in *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad.* for Oct. 1928, of De Bruyne's able article praise from an inferior critic would be worse than superfluous. But evidence of error will be welcomed from any quarter by the greatest of scholars. In this confidence the following considerations are offered. But first must come an expression of indebtedness.

De Bruyne has placed all students of the history of canonization of the Gospels under obligation by unearthing a long list of Latin Mss inaccessible to scholars *in partibus infidelium*, and by collating from them the text of a group, very early in date, of Anti-Marcionite Prologues. He gives up as irretrievably lost the Prologue to Mt, though one might cherish the hope that traces of it may yet be found in Jerome's *Commentary*, his *De Viris Ill.* and later prologues. The Prologue to Lk is still extant *in the original Greek*, those to Mk and Jn survive only in Latin translation. They seem to have originated at Rome "during the period when Greek was still the language of the Roman church." De Bruyne has shown in fact that the three surviving Prologues formed originally a consistent group, produced at one time by a single writer to meet a single apologetic purpose. Not least must we thank him for his convincing demonstration that the Latin translation of these prologues emanates from North Africa, the home of Tertullian, but a few decades after that father's death.

---

[2] De Bruyne acutely observes the numerous anti-Marcionite traits of the Prologue to Lk (p. 294f.), where the Greek Prologue-writer has naturally expanded his apologetic.

But there is room for adverse criticism also. Our punctuation, which begins Paragraph B with *Recte*, De Bruyne regards as opposed alike to, "Mss, grammar, and common sense" (en dépit des manuscrits, de la grammaire et du bon sens). Four of the Mss, including the oldest, as we have seen, omit *recte* altogether. This, however, was necessitated by the reading *verum*, so that it is on the whole more probable that an existing *recte* was cancelled than that it was interpolated without authority. But T, our oldest text, reads *Verum Archinon*, showing that the eye (or ear) of the scribe caught but one m. If the one m be connected (as the proper name positively requires) with the word next following, the sentence must have read *Recte vero Marcion* in the archetype, as our original supposition demanded, u having been substituted for o. If, then, this be "contrary to the Mss" it can only be so described in that the vowels u and o have been interchanged, the commonest of all variations. It is certainly not contrary to "grammar" to read *Recte vero Marcion*, etc.; it remains to determine what is called for by "common sense."

To connect *recte* with Paragraph A requires us to suppose (with Corssen) that the Prologue writer declared that John dictated while standing "erect," or (with Harnack and De Bruyne) that he affirmed that John dictated "correctly," a statement almost equally insupposable. The reader must judge for himself whether this is more in accord with "common sense" than connection with Paragraph B, which gives the meaning reproduced in our rendering: "But Marcion was *justly* cast out."

Understanding, then, that Paragraph A did end on the same plan as the other prologues, whether by omission of *recte* altogether or by connecting it with Paragraph B, just as the prologue to Mk ends: *Post excessionem ipsius Petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium,* and the prologue to Lk: *In Achaiae partibus hoc descripsit evangelium,* we have still to take note of the method by which De Bruyne would obtain from Paragraph B a sense not only conformable to Mss, grammar and common sense but also fraught with important historical information. Only a literal translation of his own words will do justice to his solution. On p. 208 of his article we read:

> Let us pass to the story about Marcion, where the difficulties are so enormous that a remedy must be sought. The sentence as received means that Marcion was condemned by Papias (*sic*) for his errors, that he was afterward rejected, excommunicated by John. It was to John (*ad eum*) that the heretic had presented writings, or letters (apparently letters of commendation), granted by the Christians of the province of Pontus. Obviously this cannot be historical. But where lies the difficulty? Which is the impossible word? I answer *ab iohanne.* To begin with, there are many *iohannes* in our Prologue, five in five lines. That is too many. Next Papias strikes me as a too emancipated disciple: in a grave matter of doctrine he does not consult his teacher, he takes the initiative and condemns, John merely follows the lead of his disciple. Then, the anachronism is violent; who can have imagined that John was still living in the period of Marcion? Finally our Prologue was written at Rome; granting that in the West chronology was so defective that the Romans could actually believe that John had rejected Marcion, what interest had they to recall the condemnation pronounced by Papias? Alongside of John Papias was of no account and might as well vanish. That is why *ab iohanne* cannot be the true reading; it has been introduced mechanically, by a copyist or by the translator; after so many preceding *iohannes* it has displaced some other name, the name, I should surmise, of some Roman authority. In that case all is explained. According to Tertullian it was at Rome that Marcion presented his letters, and our prologue says the same thing, independently of Tertullian. Thus one can understand the mention of Papias: John was dead, Marcion was condemned in Asia by

> a disciple of John (correctly or incorrectly our author says by Papias). Finally, it seems to me wholly improbable that in a prologue written at Rome, there should be no mention of the issue to which the Marcionite conflict was brought at Rome: the controversy in Asia had been a mere skirmish, the decisive blow was struck at Rome.

This criticism of Paragraph B is unanswerable. *As interpreted by De Bruyne* the whole thing is incredible. But his proposed "remedy" is the best example since Marcion of removal from the text of "everything contrary to his own opinion," viz, the rooted belief that the prologue is "independent of Tertullian."

Every Ms, on De Bruyne's own showing, presents the obnoxious *ab iohanne.* Variants do not exist. In addition Harnack, first proposer[3] of this Marcionesque emendation, had himself previously adduced the further evidence of Philastrius, who not later than 383–384 A. D. repeats the statement concerning Marcion's discomfiture in the form *devictus et fugatus a beato Iohanne Evangelista et a presbyteris.*

Harnack assumes that this otherwise unknown expulsion *preceded* the Roman, and that "John" (or Papias?) acted, as Philastrius assumes, with the cooperation of the Ephesian "elders." The theory implies that the whole affair remained unknown at Rome, and that even the record of it escaped the attention of all the writers "Against Marcion" from Justin to Hippolytus (well acquainted as they were with Papias), to crop up in a third-century African prologue-writer ignorant even of the name of Papias' book. Whether this supposition be in accord with common sense must again be left to the judgment of the reader.

Harnack and De Bruyne fall back upon "grammar." "*Ab eo* (says De Bruyne) must (*doit*) refer to the subject of *descripsit,* that is to say, Papias" (p. 208). We answer: Yes, *if* the grammar be that of the classic latinity of nineteenth century scholars, and *if* Paragraph A and Paragraph B were originally a unit. Both suppositions are denied. As regards the grammar of the Prologue-writer we have had occasion already to note the ambiguities of his use of the demonstrative *is*.[4] De Bruyne holds "Bacon" responsible for the fact that the statement of Paragraph B (derived according to Arts. I and II from the metaphorical language of Tertullian) is "confused" (*brouillé*). Admitting the fact that *ab eo* really is ambiguous in Paragraph B *as it now stands*, the question before us is simply this: Should we insist on the unity and the Ciceronian latinity of the prologue at the cost of arbitrary emendation; or take the judgment of Philastrius (a practical contemporary) on the meaning? Philastrius understood *ab eo* to mean *a Iohanne.*

---

[3] In *Neue Studien zu Marcion* 1923.

In Art. I doubt was expressed (p. 209) whether "the Greek argumentum included the second, anti-Marcionite paragraph." De Bruyne ignores the question. Apart from such division the "demonstration" (*pace* De Bruyne) that Paragraph B depends upon Tertullian would compel our dating the whole "in the latter half of the third century," where De Bruyne reasonably places its Latin form. But division makes needless such post-dating of Paragraph A. It is true that even the Greek quotes Papias only at second hand, perhaps through the medium of Hippolytus, and therefore cannot well belong to the period of Melito of Sardes, where De Bruyne would place it. We also continue to maintain that it is later than Irenaeus. De Bruyne admits a probable relation, but insists that the dependence is on Irenaeus' part (!). My citation of the clause *discipulus iohannis carus* as evidence of such dependence he regards as answered by saying "But Irenaeus does not quote this witness of Papias." What Irenaeus does allege (mistakenly, as Eusebius showed) is that Papias was a "hearer" (ἀκουστής) of John (*Haer.* V, xxxiii. 4; cf. Euseb. *HE* III, xxxix. 7). Had our prologue-writer quoted Irenaeus exactly the question of priority might be disputable. The fact that he exaggerates in the direction of Corderius' *Catena* shows that Irenaeus is the earlier and does *not* "depend on the prologue" (p. 206).

A date for the composition of the original Greek Prologues at

---

[4] Note the closing sentence *Is* (Marcion) *ad eum* (John). Not improbably the variant (TXEY) at the close of Paragraph A, *iohanne sibi dictante*, is due to an attempt to remove the ambiguity here in question.

Rome in the period of Hippolytus is wholly probable. Paragraph A of the Prologue to Jn may well contain a reminiscence (borrowed from Hippolytus' defence of the Johannine canon, or from some similar work, much as the Latin translator borrows from Tertullian in 250–300) of Papias' testimony to the authenticity of the *Apocalypse* reported by Andreas. Papias had no more to say about the authorship of the fourth Gospel than his contemporary Justin, and for the same reason. Claims of apostolic authorship for the anonymous Epistles and Gospel had not yet been *openly* made. The suggestion *is* made in Jn 21 24, but is purposely "veiled." Open affirmation would have invited the same violent denials which had greeted the claims of Rev. 1 9–11.

A CRISIS IN THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

L. W. BATTEN
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IT was a critical moment in the history of Israel when Rehoboam was deliberating whether to follow the counsel of his senior or junior advisors, whether to lessen or increase the heavy burdens imposed by Solomon. There is an interesting and important background to that crisis which I propose to present to your attention. Most of it is quite familiar, but part of it, so far as I know, and that a vital part, has not been brought out by the historians.

In 1 Kings 11 43 we read the story that "Solomon slept with his fathers; and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead." That is the standard formula in the Book of Kings, and except in this instance it always means that the son succeeded to the empire of his father. But that can hardly be the meaning here, for there follows directly the amazing statement that "Rehoboam went to Shechem: for all Israel were come to Shechem to make him king." (1 Kings 12 1.) The condition is so surprising that it is pardonable that it has not always been understood. For it appears that Rehoboam succeeded his father as a matter of course to the throne of Judah, but that his title to the throne of Israel—the northern kingdom—was at most but a presumptive right. The delegates of Israel under the lead of Jeroboam propose terms to Rehoboam in accordance with which they will make him their king. The words seem to me clearly to exclude the idea that they regarded him as king of Israel by right of succession. There is further neither in their words nor anywhere else in the original story the remotest hint that the Israelites were in an incipient state of rebellion.[1] On the contrary they appear at every point as men acting strictly according to their rights. That condition is acknowledged in the course of Rehoboam's negotiations, for neither his elder nor younger counsellors intimate that the demand of the Israelites savors of disloyalty, and the king of Judah himself raises no question as to the propriety of the demand. The only possible conclusion then is that the Israelites were quite within their rights, that it was entirely open to them to accept Rehoboam as their king or to refuse to put the crown on his head. It follows that there was no recognition from any quarter of a single kingdom embracing Judah and Israel.[2]

It is an interesting fact to note that when a little later Rehoboam gathered an army of Judeans and Benjamites to bring Israel under his sway he was warned of Jahweh: "He shall not go up, . . . return every man to his house; for this thing is of me." (1 Kings 12 24.) The divine oracle supports the rights of the Israelites, in spite of the bitter antipathy of the compiler of Kings to the northern empire.

Disregarding for the time the reign of Solomon, to which I must revert later, this is just the situation we should expect from the history of David. When David went to Hebron after learning of the death of Saul, the sheiks of the Judean clans came and anointed him king of Judah (2 Sam. 2 4). It is fairly clear that from the first David aspired to the crown of the north as well, though there is no intimation that his Judean crown or any oracle gave him any rights over Israel. But my concern is with the terms under which his ambition was finally realized. When Abner first sent a delegation to David he bade his messenger say: "Make thy covenant with me, and behold my hand shall be with thee to bring about all Israel to thee." (2 Sam. 3 12.) To the delegates David replies: "Good, I will make a covenant with thee." Then we read that Abner himself went to speak to David in Hebron "all that seemed right in the eyes of Israel."[3] And in concluding the interview with the king of Judah Abner said: "I will immediately go and assemble all Israel for my lord the king that they may make a covenant with thee, and thou shalt be king with all thy soul desireth." (2 Sam. 3 21.) A probably correct interpretative rendering of this passage would be: "that they may enter into an agreement with thee according to whose terms thou shalt be their king according to thy desire." At all events it is clear at every point in Abner's negotiations that there is no thought of the unconditional offer of a crown to David, but that the representatives of Israel are ready to negotiate and to propose conditions upon which they will make David their king.

---

[1] G. A. Cooke in his article on Jeroboam in Hastings' Dict. constantly uses the terms *revolt* and *rebellion*. But the historical records afford no grounds for that interpretation, for the passage v. 19 in which the term *rebelled* is used is by a late editor.

[2] Stade holds that Rehoboam inherited a united kingdom, and that the assembly at Shechem had only to do with the removal of abuses. He even intimates in a note that Rehoboam may himself have called the assembly to prevent a threatening uprising (*Geschichte*, I, 345). That interpretation ignores the plain words of the text.

In exact agreement with these preliminary proposals is the record of the actual consummation. For here is the brief record: "All the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron; and king David made a covenant with them in Hebron before Jahveh; and they anointed David king over Israel." (2 Sam. 5 3.) It is necessary to emphasize the fact that the first step was to reach an agreement, and when a compact was made it was solemnly subscribed before Jahveh, so it was a covenant of the most binding character. There is no assumption that David's sovereignty over Judah, or any prior anointing by a prophet, or, I venture to think in spite of a gloss in the text,[4] any oracular utterance,[5] gave him any shadow of a claim to the throne of Israel. And it was only after David had solemnly sworn to the compact that these elders, neither priest nor prophet being mentioned, anointed him king over Israel.

---

[3] The addition of "and to the whole house of Benjamin," and the other references to Benjamin as now with Israel and now with Judah, raise an interesting question, but it is not relevant to my argument.

[4] H. P. Smith is quite right in holding that v. 3 alone of the passage 2 Sam. 5 1–5 is from the early document. V. 1 is repeated in v. 3 and the speech of the elders appears to be from a later hand.

[5] It is true that the chronicler adds to the story of David's anointing these words: "according to the word of Jahveh by Samuel" (1 Chr. 11 3), but that is merely the effort, often worked even into the earlier story, to show that David's title to the throne was of divine origin.

So far as the north is concerned therefore, David reigns in a constitutional monarchy. The elders of Israel had been scrupulous to protect their people. That agreement between David and the elders of Israel unfortunately is lost beyond hope of recovery, and there is not anywhere in the records a hint as to its contents. And yet I venture the opinion that it is possible to recover one article of the compact. To put it negatively, the elders of Israel did not offer the crown absolutely to David and his sons as his successors forever; or positively, they reserved the right to accept or reject David's sons as they deemed best. Now I am convinced that it was precisely this at the time well known reservation upon which the elders of Israel were acting when they named the terms upon which they would anoint Rehoboam as their king. When Rehoboam rejected their conditions, they refused to put the crown of Israel upon his head, and the words they use, in view of our study are significant: "What portion have we in David? There is no inheritance in the son of Jesse." (1 Ki. 12 16.) The words *portion* and particularly *inheritance* are clearly indicative that the Israelites recognize no absolute rights of the descendants of David. *Inheritance* here may easily mean hereditary rights.

Further it is clear from the history that David rules in a dual monarchy. There is no record of a union between Israel and Judah. The northern deputies anoint him king of Israel, but nobody anointed him as king of a united country embracing Israel and Judah. The line of cleavage between the two countries discloses itself sharply during David's reign. The rebellion of Absalom certainly started as a Judean movement, for the anointing took place at Hebron, the old capital of the kingdom of Judah, and according to a statement in 2 Samuel 19 40 only half the people of Israel joined Judah in the restoration of David to his throne. At that period the Judeans said to the Israelites: "have we eaten at all of the king's cost? or hath he given us any gift?" (2 Sam. 19 42) implying plainly that David had showed disproportionate favor to the kingdom of Israel. Then the somewhat confused story shows that independent overtures were made by Judah and by Israel to restore David to the throne, and that in this contest the Israelites were so far worsted that Sheba's rebellion—if rebellion it actually was—broke out at once. The battle cry of the followers of Sheba, repeated by Jeroboam later, indicates a conviction that the house of David had no inalienable rights over Israel. And according to the records it was a Judean force which pursued Sheba and so reduced leaderless Israel to obedience. It seems clear that Judah and Israel never regarded themselves as one empire.

The crowning of Solomon does not seem to fit into the idea that Israel had any reserved rights in the choice of a king. H. P. Smith goes no further than to say that "Solomon had been fortunate in that he had been crowned during his father's lifetime, when the old king's prestige was sufficient to secure the allegiance of all divisions of the kingdom" (*O. T. History*, p. 178). Benzinger gives a similar explanation but implies that David had used his great power against the rights and wishes of the northern people (*Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 86). It may be that nothing more may be said or need be said. However, there are two phrases in the story which invite scrutiny. In Bathsheba's plea to the decrepit king she says "the eyes of all Israel are upon thee, that thou shouldest tell them who shall sit on the throne of my lord the king after him" (1 Ki. 1 20). Who is meant by "all Israel?" Benzinger interprets by translating "the eyes of the people," and it is natural to think that the queen refers to the whole dual kingdom. But David may not have thought so, for in his order to Zadok and Nathan, David concludes by saying "I have appointed him to be prince over Israel and over Judah" (1 Ki. 1 35). On his deathbed David recognizes the dual kingdom, although he assumes the right to name the king and deems a single anointing adequate to establish Solomon as king over the whole.

So far as Bathsheba's words are concerned, taken by themselves, they might well refer to the northern people, and they might mean that Israel were waiting to see whom David would name so that they could determine whether they would accept David's choice or not. That would at all events be within their rights. It is not necessary, however, to pursue what may appear to be a straining of exegesis in the interest of a conclusion. As a matter of fact Solomon's anointing was a clever coup of Nathan's to thwart Adonijah, and the people had very little chance to assert their rights. The case was different after Solomon's death. Israel then had a leader and were in a position to require a king in conformity with the terms their tribes had made with David long before.

It is a curious fact that in 1 Chr. 23 1 we have the statement: "now David was old and full of days; and he made Solomon his son king over Israel." Then after several chapters devoted to the temple, and civil and military officers, we are told that there was a great assembly of the people, and of this assembly we find the amazing statement: "they made Solomon the son of David king the second time,[6] and anointed him unto Jahveh to be prince" (1 Chr. 29 22). The first enthroning corresponds exactly to the record in Kings, but the second has no parallel in the early record. Is it possible that the Chronicler has preserved an authentic tradition to the effect that David made Solomon king of Judah, but that later Israel made him their king?

---

[6] The "second time" is doubtful but it does not matter for there are two separate anointings.

THE ARMENIAN TRANSLATION OF PHILO'S *QUAESTIONES IN GENESIM ET EXODUM*

RALPH MARCUS
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION AND COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE importance of Philo's work for an understanding of patristic theology and exegesis has long been recognized. In more recent times, however, the comparatively new study of Hellenistic religions has directed attention to other aspects of Philo's thought, which are of great importance for the reconstruction of pre-Christian religions and cults. Reitzenstein, for example, in his latest work *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, bases the greater part of his study of the pre-Christian "rebirth mystery" on a passage of Philo's *Quaestiones in Exodum*. So also Eduard Norden, Schäder and other students of Hellenistic religions are making more extended philological studies of the text of Philo.

Fortunately, we possess in the critical edition of Wendland and Cohn an excellent Greek text of the larger part of Philo's writings. But for one important body of writings, the *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim et Exodum*, we are dependent chiefly upon an Armenian version. In 1826 the Mechitarist scholar John Baptist Aucher published in Venice a fifth century Armenian version of four books of the *Quaestiones in Genesim* and two books of the *Quaestiones in Exodum* together with the Armenian of the pseudo-Philonic *De Sampsone* and *De Jonah*. Aucher's text is based on five manuscripts, the earliest of which dates from the thirteenth century. His Latin translation of the Armenian, which according to his preface, is intended to be literal rather than elegant is accompanied by a few Greek fragments reprinted from Mangey's edition of Philo and by an anonymous Latin translation of the last two fifths of the fourth book of the *Quaestiones in Genesim*, taken from an edition of Basle, 1538.

Since the publication of Aucher's translation a larger number of Greek fragments of the *Quaestiones* has been recovered from various catenae and patristic writers by Mai, Pitra, Tischendorf, Wendland and others; these have been collected by Rendel Harris in his *Fragments of Philo Judaeus*, Cambridge, 1886. On the basis of the Greek fragments which have been identified with the corresponding Armenian passages, and which amount to more than a thousand lines of the Teubner text, it is possible to form an adequate notion of the value of the Armenian version for textual purposes, and also of the value of Aucher's Latin translation of the Armenian.

With the idea of making an English translation of the Armenian text published by Aucher, I have compiled an Armenian-Greek index to the *Quaestiones*. With the help of this index, and perhaps of additional material gathered from the Armenian versions of other works of Philo extant in Greek, I hope, perhaps too optimistically, to be able to reconstruct the Greek original in part, at least to the extent of more accurately rendering the Armenian.

Such a translation necessarily invites comparison with Aucher's Latin translation, and may seem to be a criticism of the usefulness of the latter, which has been, for scholars who do not read Armenian, the chief source of knowledge concerning the important *Quaestiones*. It may therefore seem presumptuous for one who is not a native Armenian to pass judgment on the work of the learned Mechitarist. I may say, in justification of my proposed translation, that it implies no judgment of Aucher's knowledge of his native language, which I, of course, cannot hope to equal, but only of his ability to understand the Greek which lies behind the Armenian. The possession of a larger amount of the Greek original enables a modern scholar to appreciate the exact sense of many Armenian passages a little more fully than did Aucher. Moreover, a comparison of

Aucher's Latin with the Armenian, in those passages for which the Greek is extant, will show that in every case the Armenian is closer to the Greek than Aucher's Latin to the Armenian. However unimportant for general literary purposes changes in word order, rendering of metaphors, use of synonyms and the like may be, these things are of the greatest importance for philologists dealing with a translation. It may not be unfair to call attention to the fact that Aucher has incurred the critical disapprobation of such scholars as Gildemeister and Hermann Diels for certain of his Latin renderings of Philo, as one may discover from the first page of Diels' *Doxographi Graeci*.

A few examples may serve to show more clearly that Aucher has been at fault, whether because of haste (the translation was completed in a year) or some other circumstance. In *Quaest. in Gen.* iv, 102 the Greek reads *ἄξιον ἀποδέχεσθαι τὸ μηδενὸς ὀρέγεσθαι τῶν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν*; the Armenian translates quite literally *aržan e endounel oč imik‘ baḷjanal aṛawel k‘an zzorout‘ iunn*, "It is right to interpret this as meaning not to desire what is beyond one's power." Aucher, misunderstanding the figurative use of *endounel* = *ἀποδέχεσθαι*, "to interpret," translates *oportet non desiderare ut recipiantur ampliora suis viribus*. Again, in *Quaest. in Gen.* iv, 191 the Greek has *ῥηγνύμενοι φθόνῳ καὶ βασκανίᾳ*; the Armenian translates word for word *ergic̣ealk‘ naxanjou ew yač̣aḷout‘ eamb*, "stirred up by envy and jealousy." Aucher translates *instigati livore invidiae* which misses the exactness of the Armenian for *βασκανία*.

There are numerous other instances of greater divergence between Armenian and Latin than between Armenian and Greek. Not all of these, of course, are the fault of Aucher. Many are due to natural linguistic differences, and to the fact that Aucher was making a translation of a translation.

When we compare the Armenian with the Greek we are struck by its remarkable literalness and adequacy. Conybeare, in his edition of the *De Vita Contemplativa* (*Philo on the Contemplative Life*, Oxford, 1895, p. 155), has remarked the same closeness to the Greek in the Armenian of that work, and to judge from Aucher's remark in the preface to his edition of the *Quaestiones*, the Armenian version of Philo's other writings extant in Greek, might be expected to be equally faithful.

This extreme literalness of the Armenian version is due not only to the good conscience of the translator, but also to the natural resources of Armenian and its resemblances to Greek in a number of ways. We find that the Armenian adequately and consistently renders most of the Greek particles such as *γάρ*, *δέ*; in some cases it makes finer distinctions in particles than does the Greek; for example, when *δέ* is used as an adversative particle following *μέν*, the Armenian renders it by *bayc̣*; when is used transitionally at the beginning of sentences, the Armenian renders it by *isk*. Many Greek verbs compounded with nouns are similarly rendered in Armenian. On the other hand verbs compounded with prepositions in Greek, are rendered in Armenian by the simple verb and an adverb or the adverbial case of a noun.

The Armenian word order is, in most cases, very close to the Greek, in many cases identical with it. The richness of Armenian allows of the consistent differentiation, in harmony with the Greek, of synonyms and related concepts such as *ἀγαθός*, *σπουδαῖος*, *φαῦλος*, *κακός* etc.; *λόγος*, however, in its various meanings is invariably translated by *ban*. Moreover the same Armenian word very often translates two or more Greek words with an important difference in meaning; this is particularly to be noted of words with a philosophical or psychological content, for here a misunderstanding of the text may lead to quite erroneous theories concerning Philo's system. For example, the Armenian *hogi* or *ogi* is usually equated by scholars with the Greek *πνεῦμα*; and in the New Testament *hogi* does regularly translate *πνεῦμα*. But in the *Quaestiones*, *hogi* renders not only *πνεῦμα*, but also *ψυχή*, more frequently.

All the various similarities and divergences of syntax and vocabulary will be noted in the Armenian Greek Index to the *Quaestiones* which, it is hoped, will appear within a year, and which, I trust, will be of some use to students of Philo who have occasion to deal critically with the text of his important commentary on Genesis and Exodus.

THE ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S DAY

SELBY VERNON McCASLAND
GOUCHER COLLEGE, BALTIMORE

The obscurity surrounding the origin of a weekly celebration of Sunday as the chief day of worship in the early church will probably never be fully removed, due to the meagreness of our information on the point, but the history of early Christianity will not be complete so long as there is uncertainty on this question. We face the problem at once as soon as we note the lack of agreement in the various traditions of the early church as to the origin of the Lord's Day. All of the Gospels relate that the resurrection of Jesus took place on the first day of the week and at least from the time of Ignatius[1] Christian writers were fairly consistent in saying the day was kept for that reason, although Barnabas places the resurrection, appearances and ascension all on this day,[2] and Justin, in addition to the resurrection of Jesus, says the day is observed because God created the earth on that day[3] and also at another time connects it with circumcision on the eighth day.[4]

But while the Gospels agree in placing the resurrection of Jesus on the first day of the week, they preserve traces of traditions which do not agree with that view. (1) There is evidence in Matthew (27 52–53) of a tradition that the resurrection occurred on the same day as the crucifixion, in the statement about the saints who were raised when Jesus died but apparently had to wait about the tombs until his resurrection that they might go with him into the city, which seems to be a clear case of a conflict between a one-day and a three-day tradition; this one-day tradition is reflected in the Gospel of Peter in a reference to the ascension from the cross (3 19) and in the second century Quartodeciman controversy in which the churches of the East celebrated both the death and resurrection on the same day at Passover.[5] (2) A tradition that the resurrection was after three days and three nights is shown by Matthew's reference to Jonah (12 40) and also in the effort of the Syriac Didascalia to show that this tradition was really correct in a figurative sense.[6] (3) There was also a tradition that the resurrection occurred after the feast of unleavened bread, i. e., about ten days after the crucifixion, in a second statement of the Gospel of Peter to the effect that the disciples were returning homeward in sorrow after the feast, their sorrow clearly indicating that they still believed that Jesus was dead, and the fragment breaks off apparently just before describing a vision of the risen Jesus. (4) The Gospels themselves report moreover that Jesus predicted his resurrection in three days, on the third day, after three days and after three days and three nights. Now it is clear that only one of these traditions, i. e., on the third day, agrees with the narratives of all the Gospels which place the resurrection of Jesus on the first day of the week. This confusion in the early traditions raises two questions: first, how did the several traditions originate, and second, how did "on the third day" become supreme? And this latter question is inextricably entangled with the problem of the origin of the Lord's Day in the early church, for the Lord's Day was the third day from the crucifixion and its celebration has thus become an ineffaceable monument to the victory of "on the third day" over the other traditions.

---

[1] *Mag.* 9, 1.

[2] 15, 9.

[3] *Apol.* 67.

[4] *Dialogue* 41.

---

[5] Eusebius, H. E., V, xxiii, 1—2.

[6] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF. 10, Heft 2, pp. 1—368. Cf. p. 105.

I

The first evidence on the question of Lord's Day observance in the first century is Paul's statement: "On the first of every week each of you is to put aside and store up whatever he gains" (1 Cor. 16 2. Goodspeed). Another statement of equal importance is Acts 20 7: "On the first day of the week, when we had met for the breaking of bread, Paul addressed them, as he was going away the next morning, and he prolonged his address until midnight." And still another, from near the end of the century, is Rev. 1 10: "On the Lord's Day I fell into a trance, and I heard a loud voice like a trumpet behind me." We cannot be quite certain, with no more evidence than these brief statements, to what extent Sunday had been adopted in the church during the first century, though it appears that from around the middle of the century at least, as reflected in Paul's letter, Sunday assumed considerable importance; and this impression is greatly strengthened by the evidence of the Gospels on the question, which say expressly that Jesus rose from the dead on that day. And the Gospel of John states not only that Jesus rose on the day after the Sabbath but also that he appeared to the disciples again after another week, which would have been on the next Sunday, thus showing observance of two Sundays in succession. This is strong evidence that by the time the Fourth Gospel was written Sunday had been adopted by the church as its day of worship. But the Gospel of Mark, twenty-five years earlier, bears remarkably strong testimony to the same effect, for, as Bacon has shown,[7] the chronological data of this gospel show that its arrangement conforms to the western method of observing Passover, which was to begin the celebration on Nisan fourteenth and complete it only on the Sunday following, as against the eastern custom of devoting only the one day, Nisan fourteenth, to both the crucifixion and resurrection (Eus. H. E., V. 23). This shows that for the western churches even as early as the writing of Mark Sunday had assumed enough importance to control the Passover celebration, that soon after the middle of the first century Sunday had come to have an important place in the church.

---

[7] *The American Journal of Theology,* XV (1911), pp. 272—403. Cf. p. 375.

Statements in the Didaché (xiv) and the letter of Pliny (19 96) are evidence from the beginning of the second century, and from that time on the evidence of Sunday observance is abundant.

Along with this emergence of Sunday, however, the Sabbath continued to be almost universally observed, for, although Jesus and the early disciples advocated a more liberal interpretation of Sabbath regulations, there is no reason to doubt that they were faithful in observing the day, and even Paul, in spite of his controversy with the legalists, was not so very irregular in this respect. But the very fact that Paul had to make his fight against a legalistic observance of the Sabbath[8] indicates the hold which the Sabbath retained at the time, and the same conclusion is to be drawn from Ignatius[9] and Barnabas[10], early in the second century. For, as a matter of fact, as late as the third century, after the Lord's Day was firmly rooted in the church, the Apostolic Constitutions found it necessary to regulate Sabbath observance,[11] but the Lord's Day continued to increase in importance until at last in 321 A. D. Constantine made it a national holiday.

Relative to the time and place and persons involved in the rise of Sunday observance, all of the data from the first century, as indicated above, come from the Greek speaking churches of Asia Minor and the West, and the earliest specific mention of Sunday observance points to the region of Paul's missionary labors where he had made his struggle against the Judaisers, in which the membership was predominantly Gentile and had come out of Gentile religions. So in our study of the genesis of the Christian day of worship these data from Paul's churches may be expected to throw light on our problem. Modern research has shown that most questions of Christian origins lead back to both Jewish and Gentile sources, and that may be the case in regard to the Lord's Day; but, at the same time, it is not inconceivable that the roots of certain Christian practices and institutions were neither Jewish nor Gentile, but were entirely new creations of the Christian movement itself, so we must first interrogate the church for its own account of the origin of the Lord's Day.

---

[8] Gal. 4 10; Col. 2 16.

[9] *Mag.* ix.

[10] XV, 8—9.

[11] II, 59; VII, 23; VIII, 33.

II

There is no statement from Christians in the first century as to why they observed Sunday for worship, but certainly from the time of Ignatius (Mag. ix), about 112 A. D., with slight exceptions, the day was observed because on that day "our life sprang up through him and his death," i. e., because Jesus had risen on that day. But this explanation is not entirely satisfying for two reasons: first, as indicated at the outset, the first day of the week agrees only with "on the third day" whereas there were other divergent traditions in the early church as to the length of time that Jesus lay in the grave, and these traditions must in some way be accounted for; and, in the second place, to say that Sunday is observed because Jesus rose on that day is really a *petitio principii*, for such a celebration might just as well be monthly or annually and still be an observance of that particular day. It is yet possible, nevertheless, that the day on which the first vision occurred had some influence in determining the day of the week on which the resurrection was believed to have taken place. Mark's statement that the three women who found the empty grave fled in terror and told no one of what had happened, and his references to Galilee in this connection (16 7; 14 28), together with Paul's statement (1 Cor. 15 1—8), show that the belief that Jesus had risen from the dead was due, not to the discovery of an empty grave, but to visions of the risen Jesus, and that these visions occurred in Galilee. Such evidence makes it improbable that the first vision occurred on the first Sunday after the crucifixion, for a Sabbath had intervened and the disciples had scarcely had time to get back to Galilee; so the vision may have been as much as ten days later, after the feast of unleavened bread, as indicated by the closing fragment of the Gospel of Peter. But if the vision at this late date was on Sunday it would be scarcely possible to account for the observance of Sunday in such an accidental way. These phenomena, while of course not certainly disproving the Christian statement as to the origin of Sunday observance, present so many problems that we are driven to look into the Jewish and Gentile sources for further light on the question.

III

From the Jewish side, the celebration of the death or resurrection of Jesus, or both, might conceivably have become connected either with the Passover, the Sabbath, or the day of the firstfruits offering, because, according to Mark, Jesus was crucified on Nisan fifteenth, having eaten the Passover with his disciples the preceding day, while John places the crucifixion on Passover day itself; in both accounts Jesus lay in the grave on the Sabbath; and it was the day following the Sabbath of Passover week that the firstfruits offering was made (Lev. 23 11). Was either of these days connected with the origin of the Lord's Day?

The death of Jesus did come to be connected with the Passover in early Christian thought (1 Cor. 5 7); in the Gospel of John he is presented as the lamb of God and was crucified at the very time the Passover lambs were slaughtered (1 29; 19 31–37); and in the second century the Quartodecimans celebrated both his death and resurrection on Passover day; but this connection with Passover has no light whatever to throw upon the origin of the Lord's Day, save that the Quartodeciman practice indicates a tradition that Jesus had both died and risen on the same day, and this is of no help to us in the solution of the problem of Sunday observance except that negatively it may suggest influences outside of the Christian traditions. The church took over Passover but it had no connection with the Lord's Day.

The day of the firstfruits offering, when the sheaf was "waved before Jahveh," is believed by Professor Bacon (op. cit. p. 390) to have suggested the Lord's Day observance to the early church, for the church worshiped their Lord who had been "raised up" on the very day when the firstfruits offering was waved before Jahveh, and Paul refers to Jesus as the "firstfruits of them that sleep" (1 Cor. 15 20). There were two ways of interpreting "the morrow after the Sabbath" for the firstfruits offering; the orthodox way was to count the first day of the feast, i. e., Nisan fifteenth, a Sabbath, and to make the firstfruits offering the next day but the Boethusion Sadducees and the Samaritans made this phrase refer to the regular Sabbath, so that their offering would always fall on Sunday of Passover week.[12] Assuming that John is correct however in placing the crucifixion on Nisan fourteenth, against the synoptics, in line with the Quartodeciman tradition, in that year both methods would agree and the offering would fall on Sunday according to either method. The difficulty with this conjecture is twofold: in the first place, this firstfruits practice was an annual affair rather than a weekly event as the Lord's Day was and there would seem to be no sufficient reason for a weekly celebration arising out of it; and, in the second place, it seems more natural to interpret Paul's reference to Jesus as the "firstfruits of them that sleep" in a purely symbolical sense; Paul was thinking of the symbol rather than of the time; for him Jesus was the first example of the unnumbered dead to rise and would have been the firstfruits regardless of the day of his resurrection.

The Sabbath, however, has much greater affinity with the Lord's Day for it was a weekly observance, so that we naturally expect influence from this Jewish practice in the rise of the Christian day of Worship. But the resemblance between the two days hardly extended further than the mere fact that they both came once each week, for the methods of observance were radically different. Until near the close of the second century Christians, although worshiping on Sunday in their assemblies, did not refrain from ordinary duties. Tertullian advises Christians to defer their business on that day lest they give place to the devil,[13] but Origen is rather embarrassed by the fact that the church observes days at all, and his ideal is that all days be observed alike.[14] The Apostolic Constitutions require that slaves be given leisure both on the

---

[12] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, I, p. 280; II, p. 598, etc.; ERE. V. 879b.

[13] *de oratio.* 23.

[14] *ad Celsum* viii 22—23.

Sabbath and on the Lord's Day, though the rigor of the old Sabbath is not manifest even here.[15] Another radical difference from the Sabbath was that the Christian day of worship was named for the Christian Lord, whereas the Sabbath was named from its character as a day of rest and not from Jahveh. While agreeing in the point that both days were weekly, they were however entirely different in the much more fundamental facts of their names and actual characters. Did Sunday owe its rise to the prior existence of the Sabbath? Was Sunday in the church intended to take the place of the Sabbath? Was it to be the Christian Sabbath? There was opposition to taking over Jewish fast days,[16] but there seems to have been no objection to the regular Jewish festivals, Passover, Pentecost, etc., which were taken into the church with Christian interpretations. If Christians desired a Christian Sabbath, why did they not use the Jewish Sabbath with a Christian interpretation? The opposition to the Sabbath reflected in the Gospels was to the method of keeping the day rather than to the day itself, and there seems to be no intention of discarding it. The Sabbath would have been instrumental in causing Jewish Christians to observe one day weekly, for they had learned hebdomadal practice in their Jewish life; they would be expected to carry over to the new religion the needs for weekly observance that had been acquired in their earlier religious training; but Jewish Christians did not bring over with them already established needs for a day with the character which the Lord's Day possessed.[17]

IV

Turning now to the Gentile world in search of data that might throw further light on the problem, we find that the weekly division of time existed in the ancient Orient independently of the

---

[15] viii 33.

[16] Didaché viii.

[17] Mark. 2 27; 3 4. In the Rabbinic speculation (Strack-Billerbeck, I, 1054) the first day of the week was "crowned with twelve crowns;" it was the first day of creation, for priestly service, tribal chieftains, the coming of the Shekina, etc., but this hardly had any connection with Christian Lord's Day observance.

Jewish Sabbath. The weekly reckoning of time is traced back to the Babylonians and Assyrians, and the Sabbath itself may even have been derived from that source.[18] And there is conclusive evidence that by the first century A. D. the Mediterranean world was familiar with a weekly reckoning of time. Josephus boasts, certainly with exaggeration, that there is no nation whatever, "whither our custom of resting on the seventh day has not come,"[19] but there would be no reason for his making the statement unless the week had already attained wide recognition. Many Roman writers of the time are familiar with the Sabbath.[20] Suetonius states that the grammarian Diogenes was accustomed to lecture at Rhodes on the Sabbath and that he refused to admit Tiberius to hear him at another time.[21] Clement of Alexandria claimed that the seventh day was recognized as sacred, not by Hebrews only, but also by the Greeks.[22] Dion Cassius writes that the custom of referring the days to the seven stars called planets was instituted by the Egyptians, "but is now found among all mankind, though its adoption has been comparatively recent; at least the ancient Greeks never understood it so far as I am aware."[23] And beginning with Saturday he gives the heavenly bodies as follows: Kronos, Helios, Moon, Ares, Hermes, Zeus and Aphrodite. Further evidence to the effect that the weekly division of time was already widely recognized by the beginning of the Christian era is a picture discovered at Herculaneum, and therefore painted by 79 A. D., with the heads of seven planetary deities in the order of their days: Saturn, Apollo, Diana, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus.[24] There can be no doubt that the weekly division of time was already widely recognized by the beginning of the Christian era. That being the case, it would not be necessary to assume that Christians derived their custom of meeting together for weekly celebrations from Sabbath observance in Judaism, for many of the early converts, in fact most of them, had never been Jews and were familiar with religious practices of the Gentile world instead.

---

[18] ERE. "Sabbath;" "Sunday."

[19] Against Apion. ii, 40.

[20] Tibullus, I, iii, 18; Ovid, Ars Amat. i, 415; Martial, IV, iv, 7; Horace, *Satires*, I, ix, 69; II, iii, 290; Juvenal, *Satires*, xiv, 90—98.

[21] Tiberius, xxxii.

[22] *Strom.*, V, 14.

[23] History of Rome, xxxvii, 17—19.

[24] ERE. "Sunday;" Vol. xii, p. 104. Cf. also F. H. Colson, *The Week*, Cambridge 1926, pp. 18 f., 62 f.

In the matter of the name Lord's Day we shall have to go beyond the limits of Judaism which had no custon whatever to correspond to that of naming Sunday in honor of the Lord, i. e., the Lord's Day. As indicated in the statement of Dion Cassius above this practice came from the Egyptians; and the same testimony is borne by Herodotus in the fifth century B. C.: "These other things were invented by the Egyptians. Each month and day is assigned to some particular god; and according to the day on which each person is born, they determine what will befall him, how he will die, and what kind of person he will be."[25] Whether it is entirely correct to say that this custon was invented by the Egyptians is an incidental matter; it is of importance only to note that the practice was not Jewish and that it was already old in the ancient world when the Christian church arose. For a custom which might have influenced Christians to designate *Κυριακή* in honor of their *Κύριος* we shall therefore have to go outside the bounds of Judaism, for Christians have followed a pagan way of designating days which was already old when they began to speak of the Lord's Day.[26] The only significant point of agreement between the Lord's Day and Jewish practices of the time is the hebdomadal agreement with the Sabbath; on the other hand, however, there was no hebdomadal Sunday observance in Judaism, the character of the Sabbath was different from that of the Lord's Day, and the name *κυριακή* has its parallel in pagan rather than in Jewish life.[27]

---

[25] III, 82.

[26] The terms *κῦριος* and *κυριακός* occur frequently earlier than the New Testament. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the N. T.* etc.

[27] *κυριακή* occurs only twice in the N. T. (1 Cor. 11 20; Rev. 1 10); in both places as an adj.; but in Rev. 1 10 the expression *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα* occurs; after the time of Didaché, 14, 1, *κυριακή* is frequent as a substantive; and *κυριακόν*, church building, parallel to *βακχεῖον*, *μιθραῖον*, etc.

V

Cumulative evidence leads us to look, therefore, for a day in the non-Jewish religious life of the Hellenistic world which may have made some contribution to Lord's Day observance in the church. Deissmann has called attention to evidence that the Imperial cult in Asia Minor and Egypt consecrated one day of each month, apparently the first, to the worship of the emperor, and called it *σεβαστή*, and he believes that this day with its name may have had something to do with the naming of *κυριακή*.[28] The case is without doubt an exact linguistic parallel; it is also a religious parallel, in that both *κυριακή* and *σεβαστή* are named for the divinities to whom they are devoted; but in the matter of weekly observance the similarity breaks down.

A more exact parallel at the point where *σεβαστή* breaks down is Saturday, named for Kronos (Saturn), and called *κρονική*. It is called *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κρόνου* just as Sunday is called *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἡλίου*. Plutarch writes of *ἡ κρονικὴ ἑορτή* and *αἱ κρονιάδες ἡμέραι*.[29] But most remarkable is the example of Justin where he refers to Saturday as *ἡ κρονική*, an exact parallel to *ἡ κυριακή*, and the example occurs in a passage where he twice refers to Sunday as *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἡλίου*, which shows that his way of designating Saturday is not patterned from *κυριακή* but is recognized usage of his time.[30] In this case we have not only the designation of Saturday for a deity, but also the fact that this day, just as the Christian *κυριακή*, comes once a week. The parallel however is more superficial than it at first appears, for there is no evidence of a religious observance of *κρονική* which at all resembles that which characterized the Lord's Day, so as far as the real character of the two days was concerned there was no significant parallel between them.

At this point mention may be made of the large place of Sunday celebration among the Mandeans, communities of whom were found in recent times in the lower valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates still tracing their ancestry back to John the Baptist. Their practices have come to light with the publication of an authentic translation of their sacred literature by Mark Lidzbarski.[31] In this Literature Sunday is frequently mentioned and is observed as a most sacred day; it is even personified and prayed to and will serve as a witness for the soul, etc.[32] If their claim to John the Baptist as their founder could be accepted without question and we knew that Sunday observance had characterized them from the beginning, we might feel with certainty that we had found the origin of Christian Sunday, but this is not the case. The great importance of John the Baptist, of Palestine, of Jerusalem, of baptism in the Jordan, of hatred of the Jews, as well as a bitter polemic against Jesus as a false Messiah, all lend themselves nicely to their theory of their origin; and the Gnostic speculation which fills this literature is closely akin to the Johannine writings of the New Testament; but the fact that nothing whatever is known of these people before the rise of Islam may well make us skeptical of their claim to such an early origin.[33] Moreover, even Lidzbarski, who would accept the view that they come from John the Baptist, admits that the passages in which Sunday has so much importance are of a very late date, so that they cannot be of any significance for the problem of the origin of the Christian Sunday. On the whole, those scholars who see in the Mandeans the influence of a late Christian Gnostic sect, although they may in some way go back to John, are probably correct in their interpretation.

---

[28] *Licht vom Osten* (1923), pp. 298ff., cf. Colson, op. cit., p. 125.

[29] *Vita Pom.* 24; *Vita Cic.* 18.

[30] *Apology*, 67, 7, 2.

VI

Another non-Jewish source, however, which may throw real light on the origin of Christian Lord's Day is Oriental Sun worship, which had existed in various forms from time immemorial and was known best in the Occident as it was found in Mithraism. The name Sunday, *dies solis*, *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἡλίου*, indicates the connection which this day had with the worship of the Sun. It is well known that long before his identification with Sol in the Occident, Mithra had been the god of light in his Oriental home, but after he came into the Roman world he was often referred to under such titles as *Helios*, *Sol*, *Sol invictus*, *Sol invictus Mithra*, *Dominus Mithra*, *Sol invictus Dominus Mithra*, etc.[34] For the purpose of our present inquiry two questions relative to Mithraism are of supreme importance: was Sunday celebration characteristic of this cult; and did Mithraism enter the Mediterranean world early enough to have influenced the church in its adoption of Sunday as its Lord's Day? We cannot answer either of these questions with finality, due to our lack of information about the earlier forms and provenance of Mithraism, but, nevertheless, sufficient data are available, we feel, to justify tentatively at least an affirmative answer to both questions. The authoritative worker in this field is Cumont and his testimony is of greatest value on the two questions here propounded. According to this authority the number seven had a special value in the rites of the Mithraic cult, there were seven degrees of initiation, and the system of naming the seven days of the week for the seven planets which had originated earlier in Babylonia came into the Roman world at the very time that Mithraism made its entrance there and was probably brought by Mithraism. "There is no doubt that the diffusion of the Iranian mysteries had a considerable part in the adoption by the pagans of the week with Sunday as a feast day."[35] From a passage of Celsus preserved by Origen,[36] which by means of a ladder of seven portals presents an allegory of the passage of souls through the spheres of the seven planets, in which the last portal is that of the Sun made of gold,

---

[31] *Das Johannisbuch der Mandaeer* (1915); *Die Mandaeischen Liturgien* (1920); *Das Ginza* (1925).

[32] Cf. *Johannisbuch*, pp. 68, 82, 83, 96, 101, 110—111, etc.; *Ginza*, pp. 283, 285, etc.; *Liturgien*, pp. 34, 147, etc.

[33] Cf. Brandt, ERE. viii, "Mandeans;" Lidzbarski's introductions; Reitzenstein, ZNTW. (1927), xxvi, 1; Bultmann, ZNTW. (1925), xxiv, 1—2; Schaeder, Bibliothek Warburg (1926), pp. 203—350; Petersen, ZNTW. (1925), xxiv, 3—4; S. A. Pallis, *Mandean Studies*, Toronto (1926).

---

[34] Franz Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*. 2 vols. Bruxelles (1896—99). Cf. Vol. II, Index of titles of Mithra, p. 532.

[35] op. cit., Vol. I, p. 119.

[36] *ad Celsum*, VI, 21.

Cumont sees evidence that the week with Sunday at its head was important in Mithraism; the same conclusion is drawn from the seven arched portals designed at the foot of the figures of the planets in the pavement of a Mithreum at Ostia; and there is also a relief which has a series of busts commencing with that of the Sun, not, as is ordinarily the case with that of Saturn.[37] "The *dies solis* was evidently the most sacred day of the week for the devotees of Mithra, and just as the Christians, they were obliged to keep Sunday holy and not the Sabbath."[38] Again Cumont observes: "Each day of the week the planet to which it had been consecrated was invoked at a certain place in the crypt, and Sunday, over which the Sun presided, was especially sacred."[39] "The rites which they practiced offered numerous analogies; the devotees of the Persian god, just as the Christians, were purified by a baptism; they received the power to combat evil demons by a confirmation; and they attained health of soul and body by a communion. And as these also they sanctified Sunday and celebrated the birth of the Sun on Dec. 25."[40] In justice to Cumont himself however it should be stated that he did not derive the Christian Lord's Day from the Mithraic Sunday.[41] In the matter of parallels between Christianity and Mithraism there always remains the question of the date of the rites involved, but in regard to Sunday it is not necessary to show that Mithraism with its most elaborate forms existed prior to the rise of the church, and the original character of Mithra as Sun God[42] makes it probable that the special observance of Sunday was one of its oldest practices. That is indicated by Cumont's conclusion that the week was brought into the Mediterranean world by this cult.

As to the date at which Mithraism entered the Mediterranean world the evidence is fragmentary but at least one monument comes from the first century B. C. Antiochus I. of Commagene (69–38 B. C.) erected a monument at Nimrud Dagh on which Mithra was identified with Apollo, Helios and Hermes, relative to which R. Pettazoni remarks: "The inscription of Antiochus I. is then the first Anatolian document of that Hellenization of Mithraism, which was the primary condition necessary for its ulterior expansion in the Occident.[43] The cult of Mithra made its way into Rome in the first century B. C., whither it was carried by Cilician pirates captured by Pompey in 67 B. C.[44] That was almost a hundred years before Christian missionaries founded the church in Rome. Just how soon it actually gained a footing there we do not know but we have a Mithraic inscription from Rome set up by a freedman of the Flavian dynasty, i. e., 70–96 A. D.[45] Nero himself seems to have been initiated into the cult.[46] The Roman poet Statius, who lived from 61 to 96 A. D., shows familiarity with the cult in his allusion to "Mithra as beneath the rocks of the Persian cave he presses back the horns that resist his control."[47] The next oldest Mithraic monument from Rome which we possess was set up by a slave about 102 A. D.[48] The mysteries of Mithra were popular with soldiers and they were established at Carnuntum on the Danube by the fifteenth legion about the beginning of the reign of Vespasian.[49] Regardless of the condition of Mithraism in other parts of the empire, it is clear, therefore, that it had found its way into Rome with sufficient success to leave monumental remains before the end of the first century A. D.; and according to Plutarch it had been carried there in 67 B. C. But in Asia Minor and northern Syria the cult had been popular for at least two centuries B. C. Evidence of that is the fact that the famous group of Mithra the bull-slayer, which adorned every Mithraic shrine, was created by the Pergamene school of art.[50] This work of art proves beyond a doubt that the cult of Mithra had already attained its position in Asia Minor when the Pergamene school was flourishing.

---

[37] op. cit. Vol. I, p. 114. The marble of Bologna.

[38] op. cit. Vol. I, p. 119.

[39] op. cit. Vol. I, p. 325.

[40] op. cit. Vol. I, p. 339.

[41] ibid. Note 5.

[42] Strabo, *Geog.*, XV, ii, 13. But cf. Colson, op. cit., p. 74 f.

---

[43] *I Misteri*, Bologna (1923), p. 238ff.

[44] Plutarch, *Vita Pom.* 24.

[45] Cumont, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 105, Ins. 66.

[46] ibid. I, p. 239; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxx, 6.

[47] *Thebaid*, I, 717.

[48] Cumont, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 106, Ins. 69.

[49] ibid. I, p. 245.

Further light on the early diffusion of Mithraism has been attained recently from a Greek papyrus discovered in the Fayûm in Egypt which dates from the third century B. C.[51] This papyrus contains a list of sheep and lambs for sacrifices in the Μιθραῖον located there and of the persons who brought the sacrifices. This Mithreum in the Fayûm in the third century B. C. was probably due to Persian soldiers who were sent there during the Persian period; and it is probable that Mithraism was brought by Persian garrisons to Asia Minor at the same time, where it became popular enough to appear in Pergamene art in the second century B. C.[52] It is of especial significance for the present study that Mithraism had such a firm hold in Asia Minor, long before the rise of Christianity in that same region under the missionary work of Paul, where its emphasis on Sun worship had accustomed its devotees to a reverence for that day of the week which was dedicated to the Sun. It was in this very region that Paul had fought against those who would bind the Sabbath on his churches;[53] and it was in these churches that we found the earliest accounts of observance of the Lord's Day. May it not well be that Paul was led to take his stand relative to the Sabbath, not only by his own reaction against legalism, but also because of influences in his environment which had caused Sunday already to have a place of honor among the days of the week? May not Mithraism with its veneration of Sunday have prepared the way for the Lord's Day? The various considerations of this study suggest such an hypothesis.

It is not impossible that the rather enigmatical phrase in the Didaché κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου would be cleared up by such an hypothesis.[54] The phrase might then reflect the fact that a κυριακή other than that of the Lord existed, for why else was it necessary to write Lord's Day *of the Lord*?

---

[50] ERE. "Mithraism." Vol. viii, p. 754.

[51] J. Gilbert Smyly, Royal Irish Academy, *Cunningham Memoirs*, No. xii, *Papyri from Gurob*, pp. 36—38 (1921).

[52] F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, Chicago (1910), p. 11.

[53] Gal. 4 10; Col. 2 16.

Sunday in Mithraism agreed with the Lord's Day in that it was consecrated to a divinity and, so far as we can recover, in its general character, i. e., the deity to whom it was consecrated was worshiped on that day but work and ordinary occupations were not prohibited. And it agreed moreover in being the same day of the week. Its affinities with the Lord's Day appear thus to have been much closer than was the case of the Jewish Sabbath. To construct such an hypothesis does not mean that early Christians deliberately borrowed Sunday from Mithraism but assumes only the general psychological principle which underlies all syncretism. In conversion from one religion to another, converts, although intending to break completely with their old life and habits, in reality, yielding to the innate conservatism of human beings, actually make only those readjustments which are necessary to fit into their new situation. For that reason no transplanted religion is ever what it was in its original home; that applies both to the inner interpretations and to the outward rites. We do not know how many converts Paul made from Mithraism but we do know that he made many converts in regions where the environment had long been subject to the influence of Mithraic practices, and with that knowledge our hypothesis may be of value. Moroover the existence of Sun worship from time immemorial around the Mediterranean, in conjunction with the early acceptance of the planetary week in the Hellenistic world, provided a still much wider basis than Mithraism for pagan reverence for the day of the Sun.

On the basis of this hypothesis, the divergences in the early traditions relative to the day on which Jesus rose from the dead would also be accounted for. The traditions regarding the day of the resurrection would be accounted for as reflections of scriptures which were thought to refer to the resurrection, the day on which the first vision occurred, or of beliefs as to the length of time the spirit lingered about the body before its departure. The Lord's

---

[54] Didaché, xiv.

Day arose independently of those traditions on the basis indicated in this study—a conjunction of hebdomadal practice in Judaism with that in Sun worship—but was then consecrated to the Lord who was worshiped on that day. The next step was to adopt that version of the three days motif—on the third day—which synchronized with their Lord's Day observance; and finally to validate the practice with scripture.[55]

Examples quite similar to the case indicated in this study are the Hebrew and Mohammedan Sabbaths. We do not certainly know the origin of the Hebrew Sabbath, although it probably dates back to their Semitic ancestors, but it is accounted for in their own literature, as the day on which God rested from creation,[56] as a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt,[57] and as a sign of Jahveh's covenant.[58] The Sabbath in Islam is Friday, which is said to have been a day of assembly of some kind long before the time of Mohammed; but his followers observe it because "On this day Adam was created; on this day Adam was taken into Paradise, and turned out from it also on this day; and the day of the resurrection will not be on any day but Friday."[59]

---

[55] Justin, *Apol.* 67; *Dialogue* 41. Tertullian, *Against Marcion,* IV, xliii; *Against the Jews,* 13.

[56] Gen. 2 3; Ex. 20 11.

[57] Deut. 5 15.

[58] Ezekiel, 20 12.

[59] ERE. "Sabbath." Vol. X, p. 894.

WAS EZEKIEL IN THE EXILE?

GEORGE RICKER BERRY
COLGATE-ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE Book of Ezekiel has been treated very gently by modern critics, nearly all of whom regard it as substantially a unit. There have not been wanting those who have considered the whole Book late and hence a pseudepigraph. Torrey assigns it to the latter part of the third century (*Ezra Studies*, p. 288), in which time it is also placed by Burrows (*The Literary Relations of Ezekiel*). The treatment of Burrows makes it probable that some things in the Book are late, but that is not clearly shown for the Book as a whole, according to his own statements. The unity of the Book is being increasingly doubted, particularly by German scholars. Hermann recognizes many later additions in the Book (see his commentary in *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*), but he takes the view, which seems to me improbable, that most of these were added by Ezekiel himself late in life. Hölscher (*Hesekiel*), expanding the views expressed by him earlier (in *Die Propheten*). regards large portions of the Book as much later than Ezekiel, including the whole of Chapters 40 to 48.

Some time ago (in The Authorship of Ezekiel 40—48, *JBL*, vol. XXXIV, 1915, pp. 17—40) I expressed the view that these chapters, 40 to 48, were not by Ezekiel. I have also dealt with the Book in two other articles (*JBL*, vol. XL and vol. XLI).

Further consideration of the matter and a study of recent writers, especially Hölscher, have led me to think not only that chapters 40 to 48 are not by Ezekiel but also that large portions in the rest of the Book are much later than his time. I have also modified somewhat the views previously expressed so that it now seems to me unnecessary to regard any part of the Book as being as late as the Maccabean period, as will be indicated more fully a little later in this article.

It seems to me that throughout the Book there are frequent incongruities, contradictions, literary interruptions, and variations in vocabulary which make unity of authorship impossible. There are also historical allusions to conditions later than Ezekiel.

Within the limits of this paper it is not possible to give any comprehensive treatment of the matters concerned. I can only offer a few suggestions along the lines indicated.

Some literary evidence, which seems quite clear, may be mentioned as indicating a lack of unity in Ezekiel. Chapter 4 is an example (here I follow substantially Hölscher). Verses 1 and 2 give a graphic picture of the predicted siege of Jerusalem. Verse 3 is another representation of the siege, less forcible and natural, having no point of contact with the preceding. This seems to be a later addition. Verses 9 (a), 10, and 11 are evidently the continuation of verses 1 and 2, describing the condition in the city at the time of the siege, viz., scarcity of food expressed in eating by weight and drinking by measure. Verses 4 to 8, on the other hand, are two pictures of exile, the termination of the exile being also implied, so that they are messages of hope. These interrupt the connection between the verses just mentioned and are quite clearly a later addition. Verse 9 (b) is also a later addition, as it connects itself with verse 5 and is a further interruption of the siege idea. The concluding part of the chapter, further, has no connection with these siege verses and seems to be a later addition. The particularly grotesque elements in the description, the command to lie on one side and then on the other for extended periods of time, verses 4 and 6, and the method of baking the bread, verse 12, see also verse 15, the latter being both unmeaning and repulsive, are thus considered to be of a later time and not by Ezekiel.

Chapter 1 may also be noticed. After an introduction in verses

1 to 3, doubtless composite and later than Ezekiel, comes a description of a storm, verse 4, followed by an account of living creatures, verses 5 to 14. This account is continued, verses 22 to 28, with a description of a firmament above the living creatures with God sitting on his throne above the firmament. Verses 15 to 21 tell of the wheels which are said to have accompanied the living creatures, these being introduced abruptly with no reference to them either in the preceding or following verses. The paragraph concerning the wheels, therefore, seems clearly a later addition, interrupting the connection (the view of Hölscher is considerably different). The paragraph concerning the wheels introduces an element of the grotesque which is not present otherwise. This first chapter is very repetitious and seems to me to contain also many minor additions.

In the matter of thought, the Book of Ezekiel contains markedly divergent elements. Parts of the Book are prophetic and parts legal, the latter element being found in some measure throughout the Book and constituting an important part of chapters 40 to 48. These elements are incongruous and frequently contradictory.

The content of the message of Ezekiel is given in 2 10. It was "lamentation, and mourning, and woe (reading קִינָה with *G*)." The sweetness of the roll, 3 3, is an incongruous element, not referred to elsewhere in the context, doubtless a later addition. The message of the prophet is one of doom, as was that of Isaiah (Chap. 6), and Jeremiah (1 10), the last statement, "to build and to plant," being regarded as a later addition, from 31 28.

I consider Ezekiel, together with Isaiah and Jeremiah, to be a prophet of doom. The messages of hope in the Book I regard as later additions. They are frequently incongruous in their context, and have marks of lateness in historical allusions, and also in language, such as Aramaisms, as Hölscher often points out. They are usually of a feeble style quite different from that of the oracles of doom. The grotesque features of the Book are all in these passages which I regard as later. Except for the note of time in 40 1, perhaps intended to cover chapters 40 to 48, these messages of hope are not dated after the fall of Jerusalem in 586, but are inserted in the midst of the oracles of doom dated before that event, after the manner of the Books of Isaiah and Jeremiah. The dates after 586 in the Book, aside from 40 1, are 29 17; 32 1, 17; 33 21, and these are not definitely connected with any messages of hope.

With these oracles of doom the legal elements in the Book, found throughout but particularly in chapters 40 to 48, have nothing in common. That is also the case with other parts of chapters 40 to 48, such as the plan for the temple and the redistribution of the land.

We come to the question: Was Ezekiel in the Exile? I suggest four principal reasons for thinking that he was not actually in the exile but was a resident of Jerusalem or its vicinity.

One reason is that if his message was one of doom, it was not adapted to the exiles. They had already suffered from the punishment which had come in the first deportation in 597. A message of doom had no meaning for them.

A second reason is that the oracles of Ezekiel were not addressed to the exiles. They were addressed simply and solely to the people of Judah, especially Jerusalem. This, of course, is a matter of common knowledge. Hermann says (*Kommentar*, p. XXIf.), "Dass die Unheilspredigt des Ezechiel sich nicht in erster Linie gegen die bereits Weggeführten von 597, sondern gegen die noch in Jerusalem-Juda Verbliebenen, sonderlich gegen die derzeit führenden Kreise der Hauptstadt richtete, lag übrigens in der Natur der Sache." It seems to me that the omission of "in erster Linie" would make this statement more exactly fit the facts. It is a thing almost incredible that a person living continually in one community should be always addressing his messages to a remote community, with which he has ordinarily no communication.

A third reason is that, so far as can be ascertained, Ezekiel shows no influence of a Babylonian environment. Such things as the living creatures of Chapter 1, and the idea of the throne of God as in the north, 1 4, if influenced by Babylonian ideas, were certainly sufficiently familiar to the people of Palestine in the time of Ezekiel.

A fourth reason is that the original commission of Ezekiel sent him, in all probability, not to the exiles but to the people of Israel in Palestine. There are three statements of his commission, 2 3; 3 4; 3 11. In the first, he is sent to "the house of Israel who are rebellious," following the better text of Toy and others; in the second, "to the house of Israel;" and in the third, to "them of the captivity, unto the children of my people." It is doubtful if all these are original. But it certainly seems much more probable that the first or second is the original and the others repetitions, than that the third is the original form.

On the basis of the view here expressed, there has been much editorial activity in connection with the Book, and at more than one time. This editorial activity would be responsible for dates and introductory material. Some of the dates, I hold, are clearly incorrect as they introduce material not by Ezekiel. This is most evident in 40 1 and 29 17, probably also in 33 21 and 20 1. The accuracy of all the dates is, therefore, doubtful.

The specific references in the Book which place Ezekiel in the exile, so far as I have observed, are 1 1, 3; 3 11, 15, 23; 10 15, 20, 22; 11 24, 25; 33 21; 40 1; 43 3. I hold all these to be editorial. Chapter 3, verse 11, has already been discussed; none of the others are closely connected with the real substance of the message. A strong reason why an editor should put Ezekiel in the exile will be discussed shortly.

There seems to me good reason for holding, however, that the activity of Ezekiel was between 597 and 586. The early part of Chapter 17 clearly refers to the captivity of Jehoiachim, verse 4, the establishment of Zedekiah as king, verses 5 and 6, and the intrigues of Zedekiah with Egypt, verse 7. On the other hand, the nature of the oracles of doom limits them to the time before 586.

If Ezekiel was not in the exile, why should an editor represent him as being there? A very good reason appears, I think, when we consider the conditions of the later (so-called) postexilic period.

The general conditions prevailing after the exile, using the common phraseology, are well known. The Jews in Palestine were subject to a foreign empire, Persian and later Greek, being ruled by a governor who was usually not a Jew, with the administration of internal affairs in the hands of the high priest. The people were not prosperous, although somewhat improved in condition after Nehemiah, and usually discouraged. The familiar messages of doom of the earlier prophets made deeper the gloom of their discouragement. Individuals, usually of prophetic temper, wished to give the people some words of cheer, which naturally was done by supplementing the existing prophetic documents. These writers, however, were not uninfluenced by the priestly spirit of the times, the general thought centered about the temple, legal regulations were much in mind. The poorer the prospects in real life, the greater the need of a cheering message, hence the bright colors, continually more and more heightened, in which the ideal future was painted. The messages thus showed a growing tendency to lose contact with actuality, the contrast between the ideal and the real becoming ever sharper.

There is also, however, a feature of the later postexilic period which is not so commonly recognized. The contrast between the ideal and the real then became intensified. Although the Jews of Palestine seemed insignificant in comparison with the great powers of the world, yet they regarded themselves as the chosen nation and thus as having an actual importance greater than that of any other people. This feeling resulted in an exaltation of everything which pertained to the past glory of Judah and Jerusalem, an exaltation which was not limited by the bounds of facts.

An especially intense form of this feeling, a very natural result of the conditions, is seen in the attitude of the Jews toward the Samaritans. The Samaritan secession, with the building of their temple on Mount Gerizim, is placed by Torrey "shortly before the end of the Persian rule" (*Ezra Studies*, p. 332). This action set up a rival center of worship, claiming to be the legitimate Hebrew sanctuary, rather than the temple at Jerusalem. This claim constituted a very real menace to the authority of the latter. Torrey has said, and I think rightly, that the chief purpose of the Chronicler was to combat this claim, "the Chronicler's great task was to establish the supreme authority of the Jerusalem cultus, in all its details" (*Ezra Studies*, p. 208).

The suggestion which I wish particularly to offer at this time is that a considerable portion of the added material in Ezekiel is dominated by this later situation, particularly being written with the same purpose, resulting from the Samaritan situation, as that of the Chronicler. These additions came from one or more authors, from about the time of the Chronicler, either directly influenced by the work of the Chronicler, or reflecting the thought of that time. The date of the Chronicler is given by Torrey as about the middle of the third century (*Ezra Studies*, p. 338).

The purpose in Ezekiel, as in the work of the Chronicler, is usually not too obviously obtruded, the real bitterness against the Samaritans is generally not made conspicuous. The purpose is reflected, however, in all that glorifies Jerusalem, particularly its cult.

To my mind, as Torrey has often maintained, there never was a real return from the exile, although some individuals doubtless returned. The real life of the so-called postexilic period of the Jews, it seems to me, came from Palestine itself, not from Babylonia. The theory of the Chronicler, however, as is well known, is that Judah was made a waste land by the captivity, 2 Chr. 36 17, 20, 21, and elsewhere, and it was rebuilt by those who returned from Babylonia, Ezra, chapters 1 and 2, and elsewhere. Hence the legitimacy of the cult at Jerusalem is traced by him through Babylonia.

The importance of Ezekiel in this connection is that he was a real prophet of the exile period, and really the only one who belongs there entirely, Jeremiah's activity being largely before the exile. The method of the third century must obviously be that of pseudepigraphy. The weight of a prophetic name was needed to make effective the propaganda for the cult at Jerusalem. Ezekiel's was thus the only available name. For the effectiveness of the propaganda, however, it was absolutely essential that he should be located in the exile. From Babylonia, from the time of the exile, must come this program for the rebuilding of the nation which should establish the legitimacy of Jerusalem and its cult.

The principal portions of Ezekiel will now be mentioned which seem to me to be dominated by this spirit of propaganda of the third century. The messianic predictions are one element. Messianic predictions, it seems to me, begin with Hag. 2 23; Zech. 6 9—13, the latter passage having been intentionally mutilated after the failure of the attempt. These passages represent an endeavor to make Zerubbabel, a descendant of David, king of the Jews. They have thus a real root in the history. The prediction in 2 Sam. 7 12, 14—16, especially verse 16, is based upon these passages in Haggai and Zechariah. The later messianic predictions are based largely upon the Samuel passage. Some of the later prophets, however, having in mind the failure of the attempt, ignored the messianic idea. The messianic predictions, of course, emphasized the importance of Jerusalem. Such predictions in Ezekiel are 17 22—24; 21 32 (Heb.); 34 23, 24; 37 24, 25, the Davidic descent of the Messiah being the principal thing mentioned in 34 23, 24; 37 24, 25.

Another example of this apologetic spirit is seen in the predictions of the return of the northern nation, Israel, from its captivity. This return, it seems to me, was always an artificial thing, never a living hope. Such a return is always presented as a part of the return of Judah from the dispersion, hence Israel is to be in subordination to Judah, especially religiously. Haggai and Zechariah have no trace of this expectation of the return of Israel, "Israel" in Zech. 2 2 (Heb.) and "and house of Israel" in Zech. 8 13 being evidently later additions, with Mitchell and others. In Ez. 37 15—28 is presented the union of Judah and Israel as they return from the dispersion under the symbol of two sticks. "And I will make them one nation in the land, upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all," verse 22. The two are to become one, but which one? "And my servant David shall be king over them," verse 24. Judah, therefore, is to be the one, with David as king, reigning at Jerusalem. Furthermore, I "will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore," verse 26. "And the nations shall know that I am Yahweh that sanctifieth Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore," verse 28, evidently at Jerusalem. A similar idea appears in chapter 16, the latter part of which, I think, is not from Ezekiel. Here, verse 60, an everlasting covenant is to be made with Jerusalem, and Samaria and Sodom are assigned a position of inferiority, "I will give them unto thee for daughters, but not by thy covenant," verse 61.

The apologetic purpose of the later author and editor becomes especially conspicuous in chapters 40 to 48. The connection of these chapters with the exile is made particularly emphatic. While 1 2, gives the date as "the fifth year of king Joiakin's captivity," and 33 21, as "the twelfth year of our captivity," the writer in 40 1, is not satisfied until he has heaped up the statements as follows: "In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was smitten, in the selfsame day."

The detailed plan of the temple in 40 1 to 43 12 reflects emphatically, as it seems to me, the apologetic purpose of the writer. There never was any actual historical need for such a plan. The temple of Zerubbabel was largely a reproduction of that of Solomon. This plan is a combination of the two, having the pillars Jachin and Boaz of Solomon's temple, which were wanting in Zerubbabel's, and the two courts of Zerubbabel's, as compared with the one of Solomon's. As an actual plan produced during the exile, it was unnecessary. The plan of Solomon's temple was familiar, it was in the existing records, there were those living in Zerubbabel's time who remembered it, Hag. 2 3, and doubtless much of it could be followed in the ruins. In an earlier paper I have attributed this plan to the Maccabean period as affording, although in a small measure, a real occasion. But it seems to me better to regard the occasion as not a real but an assumed one. It was not necessary to have this plan for the actual rebuilding of the temple under Zerubbabel. It was, however, very important for the apologetic purpose of the writer to emphasize that this plan originated in the Babylonian community and was promulgated by a prophet of God. The insistence on extreme holiness at various points in this presentation goes beyond anything in the laws of P; note expecially 43 12: "This is the law of the house: upon the top of the mountain the whole limit thereof round about shall be holy. Behold this is the law of the house." That is a regulation which was never in force, it is purely ideal, but as propaganda for the sanctity of the temple at Jerusalem it is very much in order.

The allotment of the land to the tribes, in 47 13 to 48 29, is of particular significance in this connection. This is a highly artificial scheme, of which there is no trace at any time in the history. I have suggested earlier a possible occasion for it in the Maccabean period. But it seems much better to regard it as a purely ideal scheme, and as such it has its use, for the purpose of the editor. The most significant feature is that there is a holy oblation of land for the priests and Levites, with the sanctuary in the midst of it. This emphasizes the importance of the temple, the sacredness of which is so great that it makes holy the territory of the priests and Levites surrounding it. The arrangement of the tribes, also, is not without its significance, Judah and Benjamin change places, so that Benjamin adjoins the holy oblation on the south and Judah on the north. North of Judah comes Reuben, and then Ephraim, followed by Manasseh. This pushes Ephraim and Manasseh considerably farther away from the temple and puts Judah between, as the special guardian of the temple territory.

The picture of the river issuing from the sanctuary with its miraculous results, 47 1—12, is another illustration of the purpose of the editor. The extravagant results produced by the stream show the sanctity and power of the temple.

Perhaps some light is also thrown by these considerations on the perplexing problem of the numbers in 4 5, 9. I have already indicated that I consider this portion not by Ezekiel. The usual view is that the correct number is given by the Septuagint, one hundred and ninety, instead of the figure three hundred and ninety, as it is in the Hebrew. It is argued that this is really the correct figure, it being regarded as according approximately with the history, making the captivity of Israel terminate along with that of Judah at about 538 B. C., reckoning from the fall of Samaria in 722. This is itself an idealization of history, for the captivity of Israel did not actually terminate at 538, nor, in fact, ever. But, in any case, what explains the Hebrew number? The one who is responsible for the Hebrew number, it may be suggested, was not willing to regard Israel as restored along with Judah, but he has no objection to considering that event as taking place two hundred years later. That position accords with the standpoint of the editor of this late time. In that case, I do not think that the Septuagint is the original, with the Hebrew the revision of an editor from the late point of view. It seems to me rather that the Hebrew is the original, representing the view of this late writer, and the Septuagint version a correction, by one who was sympathetic with the Samaritans. One is probably justified in thinking that the Jews in Egypt, where the Septuagint translation was made, were more in sympathy with the Samaritans than with the Jews, even if that inference from the Elephantine papyri is somewhat hazardous.

The view here presented, it seems to me, may throw some light on the question of the relation of the legal regulations of Chapters 40 to 48 to P. In the article above-mentioned (*JBL*, XXXIV) I presented some considerations indicating that these regulations were later than P. Hölscher, however, regards the late editing of Ezekiel as complete in the fifth century, before P (*Hezekiel*, p. 212). I can see force in his arguments and those of others for putting P later than these legal regulations in Ezekiel. It seems to me that all of the facts are explained if we think of the author as later than P in actual time but earlier than P in his assumed standpoint. Hence he was quite at liberty at some points, in accordance with his actual time, to give laws actually later, more developed, than P, and at other points, in accordance with his assumed standpoint, to ignore the regulations of P. Such a mixture of standpoints is entirely in accord with the nature of pseudepigraphic writings.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

MILLAR BURROWS
BROWN UNIVERSITY

EIGHT years ago C. F. Burney[1] attempted to prove that the Greek Gospel of John was a translation from Aramaic. C. C. Torrey,[2] though rejecting some of Burney's evidence, supported the main thesis with additional material of his own. At about the same time J. A. Montgomery[3] argued independently for the Jewish origin of the gospel, as shown by both thought and language, but did not postulate translation from an Aramaic original. Burney's arguments were critically examined by G. R. Driver[4] and O. T. Allis,[5] and W. H. Howard[6] has reviewed the evidence in connection with the whole problem of Semitisms in the New Testament. Recent commentators, while not entirely ignoring the theory of translation, have not attempted to discuss it thoroughly.

The question can be decided only on the basis of a detailed examination of the evidence. General considerations of antecedent probability need not prejudice our judgment of the philological data. The hypothesis of Aramaic origin does not necessarily involve composition in Palestine, nor does it commit us to any particular view regarding the date or the authorship of the gospel. Aramaic was spoken, by Jews and Gentiles, in many places outside of Palestine.[7] Doubtless composition in Aramaic would be more likely in some places than in others and would limit somewhat the audience for whom the book was intended—unless, indeed, the author felt incapable of literary expression in Greek and preferred to write (or dictate) in his native tongue, leaving it to someone more at home in Greek to translate for him. But the question of provenance and the question of language may and should be kept distinct.

---

[1] *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 1922.

[2] The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John, *Harvard Theological Review*; XVI (1923), pp. 305—344.

[3] *The Origin of the Gospel According to St. John*, 1923.

[4] The Original Language of the Fourth Gospel, *Jewish Guardian*, (1923), pp. 1—8.

[5] The Alleged Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, *Princeton Theological Review*, XXVI (1928), pp. 531—572.

[6] Appendix to vol. II of Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 1929.

So also the religious and philosophical background of the gospel, while not altogether unrelated to the question of the original language, cannot be used as a conclusive argument either for or against the theory of translation. If the gospel was written in Aramaic it would not follow, for example, that the Logos of John was the Memra of the Targums. Hellenistic thought was not unknown in Palestine or in Aramaic speaking communities elsewhere, and there was nothing to prevent its use by Aramaic writers.[8]

I. Old Testament Quotations

Burney (chap. VIII) examines in detail John's quotations from the Old Testament, comparing them with the LXX and with the original Hebrew. His conclusion is that they were based on the Hebrew, though modified (perhaps by the translator) under the influence of the LXX. In one instance (7 38) he finds reason to believe that the quotation was made in Aramaic, but his argument is based on a supposed mistranslation which is unconvincing.

---

[7] Burney, pp. 127—132, argues at length for Antioch as the home of the gospel. Salvatorelli (*Harvard Theological Review*, Oct. 1929, p. 357) speaks of the orientation of the Fourth Gospel in the sphere "of an oriental-gnostic, mysteric current of religious thought" as "confirming the recent theory... that our Greek gospel is a translation from the Aramaic." The question of dialect is briefly discussed below, p. 110.

[8] On this point cf. Torrey, pp. 309ff.

Torrey (p.327) holds that the quotations were made in the original Hebrew. Montgomery (p. 23n) explains them by loose citation of the LXX or the use of a Palestinian translation, probably "pre-Theodotionic." Driver (p.1) expresses the opinion that the evangelist was more familiar with the Targums than with the Hebrew Scriptures, though demonstrably "not unacquainted" with the latter.

Evidently there is room for difference of opinion in the matter, but we need not stop to discuss the quotations in detail. When all is said and done, agreement or disagreement with the LXX proves nothing as to the language in which the gospel was written. Where John follows the Hebrew as against the LXX, he may have used a different Greek version, as Montgomery suggests, or he may have made independent use of the original, though writing in Greek. On the other hand, when he agrees with the LXX, the use of similar or identical language in translating the same original is not surprising. Even where John and the LXX agree as against the Hebrew, both may have used a text differing from the MT, or, as Burney says, the wording of the quotation may have been accommodated to the LXX by the translator or by copyists. Any argument based upon the form of the Old Testament quotations in John, therefore, is of little force one way or the other. Not in scattered quotations, but in the evangelist's own language throughout the book is the important evidence to be sought.

II. Apparent Semitisms Justified By Greek Usage

The Greek of the Fourth Gospel is, as Torrey says (p.306), "decidedly less awkward than the typical renderings of Semitic originals." The style is "remarkably simple and clear" and the diction "generally free from barbarisms." Nevertheless there are many expressions which look like literal reproductions of characteristic Semitic idioms. Only by a close examination of these expressions can we hope to determine whether or not an Aramaic original lies back of our text. Sometimes an expression which immediately catches the eye of a Semitic scholar and appears to him to be an obvious Semitism turns out to be quite normal in Greek also. "The weakness of Dr. Burney's case," says Howard (p. 483), "is that he has not allowed for the coincidence of many of the Aramaic constructions found in the Greek of the Fourth Gospel with usages that were equally common in the colloquial Greek of the period." Where this is shown to be the case, of course, the expression in question ceases to have any value as evidence of translation.

Certainly the Greek of our evangelist is not that of an Attic purist. It shares with the Koine in general a number of traits which cannot be attributed to Semitic influence (*e. g.* such forms as *ἤμην*, *ᾔδεις*, and *οἴδαμεν*, the confusion of *οὐ* and *μή*, and the loose use of the cases with prepositions). When the Koine has other usages which happen to correspond to Semitic idioms, therefore, it is not necessarily significant that examples of such expressions should be found in the gospel. Driver and Howard have shown that several of the characteristics of John's Greek which Burney has cited as indicating an Aramaic original were also more or less characteristic of Hellenistic Greek in general, ot at least can be paralleled in Greek writings where Semitic influence is out of the question. For this reason the following expressions cannot be regarded as indicating translation:

(1) *Change of construction after a participle.* 1 32 Τεθέαμαι *τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον... καὶ ἔμεινεν.* 5 44 λαμβάνοντες, *καὶ ... οὐ ζητεῖτε.*

(2) *Historical present, especially with verbs of saying.* This is "extremely frequent" in John and is pointed out by Burney (pp. 87—90) and Montgomery (p. 18) as corresponding to the Aramaic participle, but Howard (p. 456, following Thackeray) says that it was common in both literary and vernacular Greek in classical times, and "was increasingly regarded as vernacular" in the Hellenistic period.

(3) *Imperfect as equivalent of the Aramaic participle with* הֲוָה. Both Burney (pp. 90—93) and Montgomery (p. 17) note that this distinctively Aramaic use of the participle may account for the frequent use of the imperfect in John, as Allen had claimed for its still more frequent use in Mark. Howard, however, quoting (p. 457) a note by Moulton, shows that even Mark actually uses the imperfect less than do Appian and Polybius.

(4) *Periphrastic use of ἦν with the present participle*: *e. g.* ἦν βαπτίζων, 1 28; 3 23; 10 40; with other verbs, 1 9; 2 6; 11 1; 13 23; 18 18, 25, 30. Burney, as Howard remarks (p. 452), does not mention these ten instances of a construction which exactly reproduces the Aramaic idiom just noted as the equivalent of the Greek imperfect tense. Howard (p. 451) asserts that in John and in Paul, though not in the rest of the New Testament, this construction is justified by "a certain emphasis," as in classical Greek. In the Johannine passages the emphasis is by no means "certain," whatever may be true of Paul, but inasmuch as the usage occurs in Paul and in classical Greek it cannot be counted as evidence of translation, though it would naturally occur frequently in a translation from Aramaic.

(5) *Redundant adverbial use of the relative with a cognate verb*: 17 26 ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με. Howard (pp. 419f) shows that this idiom is common in Paul (especially in Ephesians) and gives a citation from Epictetus to show that it is not Semitic.

(6) *Demonstrative pronoun in apposition with a noun*: 16 13 ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. Burney (p. 83) compares this with Daniel 2 32 הוּא צלמא; Driver (p. 4) accepts the parallel but says in both cases we have only regular apposition, as in Iliad XXIV. 90, κεῖνος ... μέγας θεός.

(7) *Redundant personal pronoun*: 9 13 αὐτὸν... τόν ποτε τυφλόν; 9 18 αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος. Burney (pp. 85f) sees in 9 18 the Aramaic anticipation of a genitive by a suffix (cp. Dan. 2 20 שְׁמֵהּ דִּי־אֱלָהָא). No other example of this construction appears in John, but Burney considers this example "so striking that it should surely count for much in estimating the theory of translation." Allis, however, among other objections, points out (pp. 548ff) that the participial phrase, if a translation, would be a free rendering of an Aramaic relative clause, and that a translator who thus substituted a Greek idiom for the Aramaic clause would not be likely to reproduce so literally the redundant suffix. In 9 13 Burney (p. 86) finds the similar use of the suffix to anticipate the direct object of a verb. Driver, however, says (p. 4) that the anticipative use of the pronoun is found in Plato, and that the Koine

uses *αὐτός* in the sense of "the aforesaid." Howard (pp. 431 ff) refers to Moulton's *Prolegomena* and the Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* for papyrus examples, adding also other parallels.

(8) *Frequent and unclassical use of ἵνα.* 1 27 *ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω.* Burney (pp. 72 f) shows by comparison with the Synoptic parallels that this *ἵνα* clause is interchangeable with an infinitive, both constructions being rendered in Syriac by the particle ܕ. Hence, he reasons, John's *ἵνα* represents the Aramaic דְּ. Driver (p. 5) gives a parallel from Demosthenes and remarks that in the last century B. C. *ἵνα* was already beginning to replace the infinitive, as it has completely in modern Greek.

9 22 *συνετέθειντο… ἵνα*; 11 50 *συμφέρει… ἵνα.* For both of these Driver (p. 5) cites good Greek parallels.

(9) *Special uses of prepositions.* 21 6 *ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους.* This recalls the causal use of מִן, but Howard (p. 461) shows that it is both classical and vernacular Greek.

16 30 *ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν.* For this causal use, says Howard (p. 463), there is some support in the papyri, though the influence of the LXX is possible here.

20 30 *ἐνώπιον.* Common throughout the New Testament.

1 1 *πρός* with the accusative, meaning *with.* Both Burney (p. 29) and Montgomery (p. 24) point out that this corresponds to the use of לְוָת in Aramaic. Driver (p. 2) and Howard (p. 467) deny, however, that the construction is an Aramaism. It is found in 1 John 1 2 and is by no means uncommon in the rest of the New Testament.

(10) *Numerals.* 20 1, 19 *τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων.* Medieval and modern Greek have this use of the cardinal for the ordinal, says Howard (p. 439; cp. 174 and *Proleg.* 96).

20 12 *ἕνα… ἕνα*, meaning "one… the other." This expression Howard attributes to the gradual disuse of *μὲν… δὲ* in Hellenistic Greek.

(11) *Negatives.* 3 16; 6 39; 11 26; 12 46 *πᾶς… οὐ* (*μή*). Burney (p. 98) cites 6 39 and 12 46, but, as Allis notes (p. 561), overlooks the other two passages. Allis also remarks that Burney's parallels include several from Paul.[9] Driver (pp. 4 f), citing Aesch. *Prom.* 215,

---

[9] Unfortunately the force of Allis' observation, here and elsewhere in his

says that this construction is very emphatic in classical Greek; in John it is merely weakened. Howard (p. 434) gives seven examples of the construction in 1 John, where, he says, *πᾶς* is positive in meaning and the negative particle refers to the verb. As a matter of fact this is true of the usage in the gospel: it does not really represent the distinctive Semitic idiom. At the same time the combination of this usage with the redundant *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* in 6 39, as Montgomery points out (p. 17), is noteworthy.

(12) *Particular expressions.* 1 6; 3 1 *ὄνομα αὐτῷ*. This idiom is noted by Burney (p. 30) and Montgomery (p. 16). Since it occurs frequently in the LXX, it might be a Biblicism (*v. i.*), but it need not be even that, for according to Driver (p. 2) it was almost the regular idiom in postclassical Greek.

1 11 *τὰ ἴδια* and *οἱ ἴδιοι*; cp. *εἰς τὰ ἴδια* 16 32; 19 27 and Acts 21 6. Burney (p. 33) sees in this expression a translation of the Aramaic דִילֵיהּ. Driver's objection (p. 2) that *οἱ αὐτοῦ* would be more literal has little force. But in this case Burney does not claim that the expressions are foreign to Greek usage; his contention is simply that they afford a natural rendering of the Aramaic idiom.

13 5 *ἤρξατο*. For a full treatment of the pleonastic use of *ἄρχομαι* in the New Testament Howard (p. 456) refers to an article by J. W. Hunkin,[10] who denies Aramaic influence except in Mark and in some of the sayings of Jesus in Luke. The idiomatic use of שָׁרִי in Aramaic may be reflected here, but not necessarily. A writer in any language might use the word *begin* in this connection. The verb *ἄρχομαι* is not used elsewhere in John, except in 8 9 (in the *Pericope de Adultera*).

---

article, is weakened by a singularly inapposite type of reasoning. The double negative also, he says, is common in John, and it is distinctly Greek; therefore "the evidence clearly shows a preference for the Greek mode of expression." As if a translator was in duty bound to prefer modes of expression that were not Greek! Naturally Greek idioms would be used except where some definite cause produced a departure from them. The question is why *any* unidiomatic expressions were used.

[10] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxv. 390—402.

All of the foregoing expressions and idioms can be explained by postclassical Greek usage. Their presence in the Fourth Gospel may mean only that the evangelist used the living language of his day instead of the artificial style of the rhetoricians. Of course this does not prove that the gospel was composed in Greek. The use of these forms of speech *may* have been due to the influence of a Semitic original. But since a Greek writer also might employ such expressions, their occurrence does not *prove* translation or even make it distinctly probable.

When these expressions have been eliminated, however, there yet remain in John, as in other parts of the New Testament, many turns of speech which correspond to well known Semitic idioms, and for which no parallels in either literary or vernacular Greek have been found. "Deissmanism" has proved inadequate to account for all the phenomena of New Testament Greek: witness J. H. Moulton's "progressive tendency to do full justice to the influence of translation" where it may reasonably be posited (Howard, p. 413). Whether or not translation was the cause of John's Semitisms, some kind of Semitic influence must be acknowledged.

III. Biblicisms

Since the LXX was the Bible of Greek-speaking Jews and Christians, it may well have been regarded, as Howard says (p. 478), as "a standard of sacred speech." Following H. J. Cadbury, Howard refers (*l. c.*) to the use of Biblical English by Bunyan and Lincoln; he also contrasts the Biblical style of Charles Wesley's sermons and the conversational English of his Letters and Journals. The influence of the LXX would appear, *a priori*, to afford a natural explanation of the Semitic idioms in the New Testament. Doubtless it was the cause of many of them.

Whether the particular Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel, however, were actually the result of Biblical influence in the Greek is another question. In the first place, one must ask whether John's Semitisms are the same as those of the LXX. In this connection Burney (pp. 7—17) distinguishes sharply between Hebraisms and

Aramaisms and discusses in detail a number of Hebraisms common to the LXX and the New Testament, *viz.*

(1) *ἐγένετο* "introducing a time-determination" (Heb. וַיְהִי).

(2) "Enforcement of verb by cognate substantive in Dative" (corresponding to the infinitive absolute).

(3) *προστίθημι* to indicate repetition of an act (Heb. הוֹסִיף).

(4) *πορεύου* (*ὕπαγε*) *εἰς εἰρήνην* (לֵךְ לְשָׁלוֹם).

(5) *ἐνώπιον, ἔναντι, ἐναντίον* (בְּעֵינֵי, לְעֵינֵי, לִפְנֵי).

(6) *πρὸ προσώπου, ἀπὸ προσώπου, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ἐπὶ προσώπου·* (עַל־פְּנֵי, מִפְּנֵי, לִפְנֵי).

(7) *τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν* (שִׂים פָּנִים).

(8) *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον* (נָשָׂא פָנִים).

(9) *δίδωμι* = 'put' etc. (נָתַן).

Of these Hebraisms Burney says (p. 15), "We observe that they are characteristically Lucan, and in some cases exclusively so." He regards them as derived from the LXX, though in Revelation and perhaps in Lk. 1—2 the Hebraisms are due, he thinks, to "first-hand imitation of Biblical Hebrew style" (p. 16). One of these expressions, *ἐνώπιον*, we have already (p. 100) dismissed as post-classical Greek. Only one of the others occurs in John, and that only once: the cognate dative in the sense of the Hebrew infinitive absolute appears in 3 29 *χαρᾷ χαίρει*. Even this might have been included above under Section II, since many parallels in Greek literature have been pointed out (cf. Howard, p. 444). It is also noteworthy that the LXX often employs the participle instead of the cognate dative to render the intensive infinitive absolute. This use of the participle, as Burney remarks (p. 13), appears nowhere in the New Testament except in a few quotations from the Old Testament.

The list of Hebraisms characteristic of the LXX but not found in the Fourth Gospel might be considerably extended. It would include such expressions as the use of *ἀδελφός* for a reciprocal pronoun, *ἀνήρ* for *ἕκαστος*, *ἔλεος ποιεῖν μετά*, *ζητεῖν τὴν ψυχήν*, *εὐδοκεῖν ἐν*, and *ἕνεκεν*. Of course in such a matter the argument from silence is of limited cogency. One must ask, among other things, what occasion the writer had to use the particular idioms in question. At the same time such expressions as those just cited and the others quoted above from Burney would almost certainly be used by any writer *consciously* imitating the biblical style. An English writer imitating the style of the King James Version would not only use archaic forms of verb and pronoun; he would also introduce expressions like "And it came to pass," "Behold," and "Go to, now." An occasional biblical allusion or echo of biblical phraseology might, of course, be introduced here and there by a writer whose style showed no other trace of Semitic influence. Instances of this, however, would be relatively few and fairly obvious.

Unconscious influence would not involve a high degree of coloring or great frequency of Semitisms. It would betray itself rather by the occasional use of biblical expressions in an idiomatic context, as in the case of the little boy of my acquaintance who prayed, "Let me have a good time all the days of my life." Not a few of the Semitic idioms which occur in the Fourth Gospel were familiar to the readers of the LXX. Their value as evidence of translation, therefore, is subject to a substantial discount. The following Semitisms are found both in John and in the LXX:

(1) *Parataxis*. Burney (p. 56) cites this prominent characteristic of John's style as "peculiarly Semitic," and Howard notes (p. 420) that while Lagrange considers it an Aramaism in John, Milligan (*Vocab. of the Gk. Test., s. v. καί*) attributes it to the influence of the LXX, where certainly it is sufficiently characteristic. Driver (p. 1) says that it is common in Greek, especially in later colloquial Greek, and that a foreigner would naturally adopt vernacular expressions coinciding with the regular constructions of his native tongue.

(2) Under the head of Parataxis the *comparative rarity of the aorist participle describing action anterior to the finite verb* and the *comparative rarity of the genitive absolute* are emphasized by Burney (pp. 56—63), who explains them as due in part to parataxis and in part to the use of temporal clauses, as in Aramaic. Driver again (p. 3) postulates the adoption by a foreigner of constructions corresponding to his native idiom, but even this is unnecessary. Tor-

rey (p. 322) denies that the genitive absolute is infrequent in John, remarking that Burney himself gives seventeen instances and that it is used exactly as in the LXX. Of course for Torrey this does not mean that John's usage has been influenced by the LXX, but that the translator of John used in these passages the same Greek renderings as the translators of the LXX had used for the same Semitic idioms. But inasmuch as parataxis and temporal clauses were familiar to the early Christians from the LXX, Burney's use of them as evidence of translation is inconclusive. Indeed the fact that they are so distinctly characteristic of the LXX is the only reason for listing them here rather than as "Apparent Semitisms Justified by Greek Usage."

(3) The *infrequency of μέν and δέ* also, though urged by Burney (pp. 68f) as pointing to an Aramaic original, might be due to biblical influence. In this case, however, such an explanation is hardly plausible unless it be supposed that the evangelist read the LXX and nothing else.

(4) 11 47 *τί ποιοῦμεν*; While not cited by any of the writers who argue for a Semitic original, this expression may be mentioned here because the "deliberative present indicative" is one of the characteristic idioms of the LXX.

(5) *Frequency of the first and second personal pronouns without emphasis.* Both Burney (pp. 79—82) and Montgomery (pp. 18f) attribute this to the Aramaic use of a participle for a finite verb, the pronoun being necessary in this construction to define the subject. Torrey (p. 322) says, "This is one of the most striking and certain Aramaisms in John." Driver (p. 4), however, emphasizes the fact that all of the instances of the first and second personal pronouns and many of the cases where the pronoun of the third person is expressed are in quotations of sayings or conversations which were presumably spoken in Aramaic. Evidences of translation in such quotations do not prove that the book was written in Aramaic, unless the sayings and conversations were composed by the evangelist himself. In any case some kind of Aramaic influence is probable, yet Hebrew also uses unemphatic pronouns, and it is conceivable that a writer steeped in the language of the

LXX might use them more than one whose literary models were the native Greek authors.

(6) *Substantival use of οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος*. Burney's interpretation of this usage (pp. 82—84) as reproducing the Aramaic הוא is rejected by Driver (p. 4), who says that the demonstratives refer to what has gone before, in accordance with Greek practice, though he admits that the construction is overworked owing to its similarity to the Aramaic idiom. The LXX also frequently uses the pronouns in this way.

(7) *Redundant pronoun referring to a preceding relative.* Burney (pp. 34f) cites as examples of this decidedly Semitic construction 1 6, 27, 33; 9 36; 13 26; 18 9. The first is not a case in point. Torrey (p. 323) gives the second as "a perfect example" and 13 26 as "equally good," and pronounces unsuccessful the attempt of Wellhausen to dispose of 1 33. Driver (p. 4), however, explains 1 33 and 13 26 by the classical practice of continuing a relative clause by clauses having personal pronouns in place of the relative. If John extends this usage to "single-limbed" clauses, says Driver, he is only overworking the idiom, as in modern colloquial Greek. Torrey admits that the construction would be possible in Greek, but says that it would not be chosen by "cultivated authors, such as our New Testament writers," that it would not be imitated except by forgers, and that it would be easily taken over in translation. But, as a matter of fact, Driver continues, 18 9 is good Greek, and in 1 27 and 9 36 *ἵνα* is not a relative particle. Now Burney's citation of 9 36 is governed by his (unjustified) contention that *ἵνα* is a mistranslation of the relative דְ. In 1 27, however, it is not *ἵνα* but *οὗ* that is resumed by *αὐτοῦ*. A better example of the Semitic idiom than this verse could hardly be found, but it proves nothing here, because John may have quoted it from the Synoptics. Besides, the construction is common in the LXX.

(8) *Casus Pendens*. Burney (pp. 63—65) cites twenty-seven examples of this construction, reinforced by a pronoun as in Hebrew and Aramaic. Driver (p. 1) and Howard (pp. 424ff) recognize the Semitic character of the idiom but regard it as a vernacular form of expression natural to a Semite untrained in literary Greek. It would certainly be familiar to a reader of the LXX.

(9) 1 21, 25, 7 40; ὁ προφήτης. Torrey (p. 343) takes this expression to mean "a prophet" (נְבִיָּא), since in Aramaic "the same form, with the same vocalization," is used for both the definite and the indefinite meaning of this noun. Assuming the correctness of Torrey's interpretation, we may still remark that the generic use of the article is characteristic of the LXX; cf. 1 K. 17 34, 36; Am. 5 19 (ὁ λέων, ἡ ἄρκος).

(10) 4 52 ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἑβδόμην. This use of the "accusative of time when" is also found in the LXX.

(11) *Cognate accusative.* 7 24 τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε, 17 26 ἡ ἀγαπὴ ἣν ἠγάπησάς με. The LXX has many examples of this idiom.

(12) *Intensive repetition.* Montgomery (p. 14) compares the Johannine Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν to the Aramaic *bish, bish,* "very bad." We may also compare the σφόδρα σφόδρα, ἄνω ἄνω, and κάτω κάτω of the LXX.

(13) 3 35 πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. Cp. Ex. 4 21 in the LXX: πάντα τὰ τέρατα ἃ δέδωκα ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου.

(14) 21 10 ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων. This use of ἀπό as the equivalent of a partitive genitive is found in the LXX also.

(15) 8 12 ἐλάλησεν...λέγων. For similar use of λέγων with other verbs cp. 1 32; 7 28, 37; 9 2; 11 28; 12 21. It would be hard to find an idiom more characteristic of the LXX than this.

(16) 17 2 ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός. The biblical character of the expression "all flesh" is obvious.

(17) οὐ μὴ... εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα 4 14; 8 51, 52; 10 28; 11 26; 13 8. (Without the negative εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is used in 6 51, 58; 8 35; 12 34; 14 16; cp. ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ... 9 32). Burney (p. 99) remarks that this expression occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Matthew 21 19 (Mark 11 14), Mark 3 29, and 1 Corinthians 8 13. Certainly in 1 Corinthians it is not the result of translation. Driver (p. 5) refers to the papyri for the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα and explains John's usage by the supposition that this *Koine* expression recalled to the Jewish writer of the gospel the whole expression familiar in the Old Testament.

(18) 18 1 χειμάρρου τῶν Κέδρων. Montgomery (p. 6n) cites this

term as "one of the few instances of correspondence with the Greek translation" in John.

(19) 1 1 ἐν ἀρχῇ. Genesis 1 1 in the LXX begins with these words.

In some of the above instances dependence on the LXX, whether conscious or unconscious, seems not unlikely; in others it is distinctly improbable, but in all it is possible. If there were no further evidence than is afforded by these idioms and expressions, the argument for translation would be decidedly weak. At the same time, the fact that some of John's Semitisms are found also in the LXX is no evidence *against* translation. Since the Semitisms of the LXX are the result of translation, the presence of the same phenomena in the Fourth Gospel may be due to the same cause.

To be sure, the LXX was translated from Hebrew, for the most part, and its idioms are Hebrew rather than Aramaic. We have already noted Burney's sharp distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms and his contention that frequent Hebraisms, as in Luke, betray dependence on the LXX, while the absence of such idioms and the presence of distinctly Aramaic forms of speech prove translation. If we suppose, therefore, that the expressions listed above are the result of translation rather than of imitation of the LXX, it might seem to follow that the original gospel was written in Hebrew, not in Aramaic. Not one of the possible "Biblicisms" given above, however, is distinctively Hebrew. With some of them translation is distinctly more probable than the influence of the LXX. They have been listed here, not because they prove dependence on the LXX, but because they *may* be so explained and therefore cannot be counted as decisive evidence of translation.

Much more distinctive Hebraisms than these, indeed, might occur in an Aramaic writing. As Torrey says (pp. 334 f), imitation of the Old Testament would be even more natural in Aramaic than in Greek. The fact that the rabbis did not follow Old Testament models proves nothing: the early Christian writings "were intended to be in some sense the continuation and interpretation of the divine revelation to Israel," while the rabbinical writers "would emphasize in every possible way the unique character of the canonical writings, and therefore would not, and did not, depart from current modes of speech in order to imitate the sacred style." Furthermore, the locutions involved were "genuine and widespread *Semitic* constructions (by no means limited to Hebrew), not at all out of keeping with the genius of the Aramaic tongue, as their Greek renderings are with the genius of Greek."

Even if the Aramaic author did not imitate the style of the Old Testament, imitation of the LXX would be more likely in translation than in free composition in Greek. For almost every Hebrew idiom there had some corresponding idiom in Aramaic, "so that the rendering of the latter by the standing Greek equivalent of the former would be not only natural but entirely correct" (*ib.*, *loc. cit.*).

As a matter of fact, only a small proportion of the Semitisms in the LXX can be called distinctly Hebrew, and we have seen that the most conspicuous of these do not occur in John. The rest are general Semitisms, common to both Hebrew and Aramaic. Indeed Torrey claims (pp. 336f) that many of the idioms commonly regarded as Hebraisms were in reality as truly Aramaic as they were Hebrew.

Furthermore, as Burney explicitly states (p. 17n), what he means by Hebraisms are the idioms of Biblical Hebrew, as reproduced in the LXX. In a Hebrew original these idioms would indicate that the book was written in an archaic style, *i. e.* in imitation of the LXX, not in the contemporary language of the Mishna and the Midrashim. In the case of John, however, this point does not require prolonged discussion. The style of the Fourth Gospel is not that of the LXX. As our next section will show, the most characteristic of John's Semitisms are definitely Aramaic. Whatever may have been the original language of the gospel, it was certainly not Biblical Hebrew.

What shall we say, then, of the possibility of a Hebrew original in a later dialect? The Hebrew of the rabbis shows a strong infusion of Aramaic influence. Burney asserts that the language of the Mishna and the Midrashim was an "artificial product;" it "fulfilled much the same function as did the dog-Latin employed by scholars in the Middle Ages, and there is no reason for supposing that it ever came into popular use" (p. 17n). At the same time, since it was used by the rabbis, it might have been used by a Jewish Christian also. But whether the Semitic original of the Fourth Gospel, if there was one, was composed in Aramaic or in late Hebrew is a point of minor importance. The first thing to decide is whether the book is a translation at all. The original language, if it was not Greek, may have been either late Hebrew or Aramaic. The hypothesis of translation does not necessarily involve a choice between these two related languages.

Still less does it imply a particular dialect of Aramaic. The language used, if Aramaic, need not have been the dialect spoken by the Jews of Palestine, either in Galilee or in Judea. It may have been a literary language, based perhaps on that of Daniel and Ezra. Or it may have been a dialect of Northern Syria. Burney (pp. 127 to 132) argues for Antioch as the place where the gospel was written. The contacts with Syrian syncretism discussed in Professor Kraeling's paper in this symposium might point to Antioch or perhaps Damascus, not to mention many other cities in which Aramaic was spoken by both Jews and Gentiles. Josephus says (*BJ*, Preface, §§. 1—2) that his history was "composed in the language of our country, and sent to the Upper Barbarians," and he names "the Parthians, and Babylonians, and remotest Arabians, and those of our own nation beyond the Euphrates, and the Adiabeni" as being accurately informed about the Jewish wars through his labors. Doubtless he exaggerates, but certainly Aramaic was widely spoken. The Nabataeans and the people of Palmyra spoke and wrote in dialects of Aramaic. The Syriac and Mandaean tongues are Aramaic dialects. Perhaps the Fourth Evangelist wrote in a dialect akin to one of these!

Whatever may have been the original language, the question of translation cannot be decided on the basis of comparison with the LXX. The contacts between the Fourth Gospel and the Greek Old Testament are not so numerous or so close as to make probable the explanation of John's language by the imitation of the LXX. Indeed the critics of Burney's and Torrey's arguments have made little use of this hypothesis.

IV. Thinking In Aramaic

The only formidable rival of the theory of translation is the view that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man whose native tongue was Aramaic, and whose forms of thought and expression were moulded by that language, though he actually wrote in Greek. One advantage of this theory, which may account for some of the favor it enjoys, is the fact that it does not disturb the traditional view of the authorship of the gospel. If a Galilean fisherman could write a book in Greek, his style might well exhibit traces of his mother tongue. Driver, though denying that the theory of translation has been demonstrated, has this to say of the result of Burney's work: "he has definitely proved up to the hilt, as I think, that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Palestinian thinking in his own native Aramaic." Allis and Howard also freely admit this kind and amount of Aramaic influence in John. In view of their unanimity in the matter, to say nothing of the independent confirmation given by Montgomery, one can only note with wonder the statement of Bernard, who, after saying that the author of the gospel was a Jew and relied on Palestinian tradition, adds, "But we must not infer that his knowledge of Aramaic went very far, and that he was a native speaker" (International Critical Commentary on John, vol. I, p. xxxi). Whether thinking in Aramaic is sufficient to account for all the phenomena, and whether it is the most probable explanation, must be considered further, but we may here state confidently that at least that much Semitic influence is quite certain.

Most of the Aramaisms in John are such as may be due to thinking in one language while writing in another:—witness the fact that such a scholar as Montgomery, while thoroughly convinced that the evangelist was an Aramaic-speaking Jew, and even while citing passages "where reversion into Aramaic appears to clear up the difficulty" (p. 20), refuses to commit himself to the hypothesis of translation. The following characteristics of John's style may be attributed either to translation or to thinking in Aramaic:

(1) *Simplicity of sentence structure.* Montgomery mentions this (p. 13) as "essentially Semitic," and Driver (p. 2) admits that it

shows Semitic modes of thought. As we have already seen, Driver also attributes the prevalence of parataxis in the gospel to this cause.

(2) *Asyndeton.* As Burney says (pp. 49—52), the asyndetic opening of sentences is "highly characteristic of Aramaic." It is also, as he shows by statistics, characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. The formula ἀπεκρίθη (ἀπεκρίθησαν), often followed by *καὶ εἶπεν* (εἶπαν) as in Daniel, receives particular attention (pp. 52—54), because John never uses the aorist participle, ἀποκριθείς, by which this idiom is regularly represented in the LXX and in the Synoptics. Howard (p. 454) sees no evidence of translation in the expression, but agrees that the asyndeton betrays an "Aramaic cast of thought." Burney (pp. 54—56) regards as especially striking the combination of asyndeton with the historical present in the frequent λέγει (λέγουσιν) of John. Montgomery (p. 16) calls attention to the asyndetic double imperative in 5 8 *ἔγειρε ἆρον* and 14 31 ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν. The relative infrequency of the aorist participle in John was noted in connection with parataxis in Section III. Allis (p. 534) suggests that the use of asyndeton in John may be a mark of a superior Greek style, since, according to Blass-Debrunner, the disjunctive or period style was used in artistic Greek prose and the connective style in popular speech. John's style, however, though often disjunctive, can hardly be called periodic.

(3) *Use of conjunctions.* Burney (pp. 66—68) cites several ways in which καί is used in John, corresponding to the peculiar uses of ו in Hebrew and Aramaic. It is used in an adversative sense ('and yet,' 1 10, 11; 2 10, etc.), in a consecutive connection ('and so,' 5 10; 6 57; 11 48; Howard, p. 423, adds 14 14), and in a peculiarly Semitic fashion to introduce a paradox in the form of a question (2 20; 3 10; 8 57; 9 34; 11 8; Howard, p. 422, following Lagrange, adds 12 34). Howard (pp. 420—422) gives good Greek parallels for all these uses, but their frequency in John is still noteworthy.

The infrequency of οὖν and δέ in John was noted in Section III; γάρ also is rarely used. In sharp contrast, ἵνα appears with astonishing frequency. In Section II we saw that the unclassical ways in which it is used are paralleled in late Greek writings, but Allis (p. 436) attributes its extreme frequency in John as in Mark to thinking in Aramaic.

Οὖν also is very frequent in John. Burney (p. 68) expresses the opinion that it often probably represents the Aramaic וְ (meaning 'and so') and in other instances may have been inserted by the translator. Allis (p. 534) again regards John's frequent use of *οὖν* as a mark of superior Greek, and adds that if it corresponds to וְ, then John in using it follows the connective style of Hebrew rather than the asyndeton of Aramaic. Of course the frequency of asyndeton in Aramaic does not mean that conjunctions are eschewed altogether. John's *οὖν* may represent the Aramaic כְּען.

Driver (p. 3), remarking that a just appreciation of the particles is "the last achievement of the scholar," declares that John in this regard shows less assimilation of Greek idioms than the Synoptic gospels manifest.

(4) *Word-order.* Montgomery observes (p. 16) that in 3 24 and 13 2 the subject is "thrown, apparently without warrant, to the end of the sentence," as often in Biblical Aramaic and Syriac. Howard (pp. 416—418) gives statistics regarding the priority of the verb in the gospels and discusses the varying opinions of Lagrange, Wellhausen, Torrey, Burney, and Norden on the question. His conclusion is that with all due allowance for other factors the tendency in Luke and John to put the verb at the beginning of the sentence "is remarkable." Driver (p. 7) considers John's word-order characteristic of a writer using a language with whose literary form he is not thoroughly familiar.

(6) *Avoidance of the first person singular.* In Section III the frequency of the unemphatic personal pronoun in the Fourth Gospel was noted. While this may be attributed to the influence of the LXX, it is much more likely that it was the result of habitually speaking and thinking in Aramaic, as Driver and Howard believe, if not of translation. At the opposite extreme from this lavish use of the pronoun, though not involving any real inconsistency, is a notable Aramaic usage, which, if recognized in John, may affect the interpretation of some crucial passages. Frequently, though

not at all uniformly, a 'plural of modesty' or an expression like הַהוּא גַּבְרָא, "that man," is substituted for the first person singular in Aramaic. Burney and Montgomery do not allude to this idiom, but Torrey (p. 330) holds that in 3 2, 11 (*οἴδαμεν*) Nicodemus uses the plural of modesty and Jesus replies with it. In the former verse it is possible that Nicodemus speaks for his nation or group. The plural in Jesus' reply has been explained by the supposition that it is really the Christian community instead of Jesus that is speaking. In both cases, however, the familiar Aramaic idiom affords a natural and plausible explanation. In 20 2 *οἴδαμεν* is almost certainly a plural of modesty (cp. *οἶδα* in v. 13). Burney's supposition that the singular has been incorrectly pointed as the plural in v. 2 is quite gratuitous. The clearest instance of the plural of modesty in John is 9 4 *ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με*. This passage is cited by J. T. Marshall (*Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Palestinian Talmud*, p. 14) in connection with the frequent use of the first person plural for the singular in Galilean Aramaic even when the first singular suffix immediately follows, *e. g.* נחות לי, literally "We will go down to me" (idiomatic ethical dative), meaning "I will go down."

The use of הַהוּא גַּבְרָא as a modest equivalent of the first singular is found by Torrey in the famous *ἐκεῖνος* of 19 35, which thus becomes a confident claim on the part of the writer himself to the authority of an eyewitness. This interpretation (given in a paper presented before the American Oriental Society in the spring of 1929) will probably be received with incredulous astonishment by New Testament scholars who are accustomed to interpret the gospels from the point of view of Greek usage exclusively, but it merits the most serious consideration. It is most probable if the gospel was, as Torrey believes, composed in Aramaic, but it is also quite conceivable that a man accustomed to the Aramaic idiom might carry it over into Greek. In either case *ἐκεῖνος* would be a natural equivalent for הַהוּא גַּבְרָא, though of course an absolutely literal rendering would be *ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος*.

Incidentally, in 21 24 we have another famous statement which is practically identical with that of 19 35 except that *οἴδαμεν* takes the place of ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν. If the one expression is a plural of modesty and the other represents another idiomatic substitute for the first person singular, both may well come from the evangelist himself, and current theories of the composition of the gospel may require revision. We may also remark in passing that the “other disciple” is often and naturally taken to be the evangelist himself, and that such a manner of alluding to himself would be quite in keeping with the Aramaic usages we have been discussing.

(7) *Use of Tenses.* Burney (pp. 94 f) gives as evidence of translation the frequent use of the present tense in the sense of the Aramaic *Futurum instans*: ὁ ἐρχόμενος (four times), ἔρχεται (twenty-two times), ὁ αἴρων (1 29, where one may question whether the meaning really is future), ἀπολλύει (12 25—ἀπολέσει in the Synoptics), τῶν πιστευόντων (17 20). Montgomery also (p. 18) refers to 17 20. Driver (p. 4) gives parallels from Paul and Luke and points out that εἶναι is used in this way in classical Greek and other verbs in the papyri; he concludes, however, that John's usage shows a natural assimilation to Aramaic practice. Montgomery (pp. 17 f) refers also to the constant use of perfects and imperfects in John. For the use of the historical present and imperfect and of ἦν with the present participle *v. s.*, pp. 98 f.

(8) *Plural verb with singular subject.* Montgomery (p. 16) cites 7 49 ὁ ὄχλος...ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν. This is not especially significant: a plural verb with a collective noun is not unnatural in any language.

(9) *The indefinite third person plural for the passive.* This is a characteristic Aramaism. Montgomery (p. 16) points it out in 12 16, to which 15 6 and 20 2 may be added. Howard (p. 448) notes these passages with the remark that the idiom is uncommon in Greek apart from λέγουσι, φασί. The passive with ὑπό, he points out, occurs only once in John. Aramaic characteristically avoids the passive, but so, for that matter, does Modern Greek (McKinlay *apud* Howard, *loc. cit.*).

(10) *Use of εἶναι to affirm existence*, corresponding to the Aramaic אית (Heb. יֵשׁ). Montgomery (p. 19) says that אית underlies, “in thought at least,” John's ‘extraordinarily large use of the verb “to be.”’. The opening verses of the Prologue and 8 58 are

cited as cases in which the verb is not the mere copula but affirms the existence of the subject.

(11) *Imperative followed by future.* 1 39 *ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε*, 1 46; 11 34 *ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε*, cp. 16 24 *αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε*. This, says Burney (pp. 95—97) is a common Hebrew idiom; it is not so characteristic of Aramaic except where the second verb expresses the result of the preceding imperative. As Driver (p. 4) and Howard (p. 421) point out, the sequence of imperative and future is natural not only in Greek but in any language. The particular expression, "Come and see," however, is a common rabbinical formula and probably here reflects Jewish usage (*v.* Strack-Billerbeck in loc.).

(12) *οὐ ... ἄνθρωπος* meaning 'no one.' As instances of this Semitic idiom Burney (pp. 98f) cites 3 27; 5 7, and 7 46. In 7 46 the word *ἄνθρωπος* may possibly be emphatic, with an implied contrast between man and Deity, but the other two passages are good examples of the Semitic expression. In Genesis 31 50 and 41 44, to which Burney refers for the Hebrew usage, the LXX uses *οὐθείς*, though the Aramaic of Daniel 2 10 is rendered *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος*. In a footnote Burney gives other references in John for the use of *ἄνθρωπος* (Aram. אֱנָשׁ) for *τις* without a negative.

(13) *Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (twelve times). Howard (p. 441) pronounces this a literal translation from Aramaic, "quite unintelligible except on Palestinian soil." The geographical limitation is exaggerated, of course, but John's use of the expression presupposes Jewish usage.

(14) *πιστεύειν εἰς* (thirty-three times). As Howard says (p. 463) this construction is Semitic (האמין ב). It is not necessarily due to translation, however, for it occurs also in 1 John, 1 Peter, and three of Paul's epistles.

(15) *Explanation of Semitic names*, often indicated by the word *ἑβραιστί*; *e. g.* Siloam, Gabbatha, Golgotha, Rabbi, Rabboni, Messiah, Thomas. Montgomery (p. 14) calls attention to this characteristic of John. Several of the names have distinctly Aramaic forms.

(16) *The plurals αἵματα* (1 13) *and ὕδατα* (3 23). These too are

pointed out by Montgomery (p. 16). Elsewhere, except for Matthew, they occur only in Revelation. John uses the singular of both nouns in other passages.

(17) 1 20 *ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο.* Cf. Strack-Billerbeck *in loc.* for a rabbinical parallel. Bernard (*ICC*) cites Josephus, *Ant.* VI. vii. 4.

(18) 1 45 *εὑρήκαμεν.* Strack-Billerbeck (*in loc.*) would here interpret this verb, like the Aramaic אשכח, as meaning "met" rather than "found."

(19) 3 2 *ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ.* Montgomery (p. 17) remarks that this has an exact parallel in the Ahikar papyri.

(20) 3 8 The *word-play on πνεῦμα* is noted by Montgomery (p. 16) as Semitic. It would be possible, of course, in Greek, but would more readily occur to a Semitic mind.

(21) 4 11; 7 38 *ὕδωρ ζῶν*, meaning "fresh water." This occurs elsewhere, as Montgomery observes (*loc. cit.*), only in Rev. 7 17.

(22) 5 14 *μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε*, cp. 8 11 *πορεύου, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε.* An interesting parallel to this expression from the Palestinian Talmud occurs in Marshall's *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Palestinian Talmud*: ליך ולא תיחטיין (p. 83, lines 6f).

(23) 6 1 *τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος.* The double designation, commonly regarded as due to an explanatory gloss for readers unacquainted with the older name of the lake, is explained by Montgomery (pp. 6, 13n) as the Aramaic double genitive.

(24) 6 66 *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.* Montgomery (p. 16) notes the plural in this phrase as "Semitic-looking," but its significance is doubtful (cp. *εἰς τὰ ἴδια* 1 11; 16 32; 19 27).

(25) *Use of term indicating place with a geographical name.* 7 42 *ἀπὸ Βηθλεὲμ τῆς κώμης*, 11 1 *ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐκ τῆς κώμης*, 11 54 *εἰς Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν*, 19 17 *εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου τόπον.* All these phrases are interpreted by Montgomery (pp. 14f), according to Aramaic and Syriac usage, as meaning "the village Bethlehem," "the place Skull," etc. In 11 1 this involves the assumption that the original order has been altered through construing *ἐκ τῆς κώμης* with the names of the sisters. Montgomery even hesitantly suggests a restoration of a possible Aramaic original in this verse (p. 16n).

(26) 8 27 *τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν*, meaning "he spake *of* the Father to them." As illustrating this peculiar use of *λέγω* Montgomery (p. 16) cites the use of אָמַר in Judges 7 4: אֲשֶׁר אֹמַר אֵלֶיךָ, "of whom I say unto thee."

(27) 14 16 etc., *ὁ παράκλητος*. As Montgomery observes (p. 14), the word פרקליט appears in the sense of 'advocate' in Pirke Aboth (ed. Herford 4 13; ed. Taylor 4 15) and may have been actually used by Jesus, so far as philological facts are concerned. At any rate it would probably be familiar to an Aramaic-speaking Jewish writer.

(28) 15 16 *ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε*. The expression "go do something" (especially in the imperative and generally without a conjunction) is characteristic of Aramaic and Syriac; *e. g.* Ezra 5 15 אֵזֶל־אֲחֵת הִמּוֹ, "go, put them;" also (unless עַל is a dittograph and אֲזַל here belongs with the preceding clause) Daniel 2 24 אֲזַל וְכֵן אֲמַר־לֵהּ "he went and said thus to him." This idiom doubtless underlies the *πορευθείς* of the Synoptics (*e. g.* Mt. 2 8; 9 13 etc.) and may account for the *ὑπάγητε* in John 15 16. Another explanation is suggested by Montgomery (p. 16), who understands the verb to mean, like the idiomatic הלך of Hebrew and Aramaic "that ye should go on bearing fruit." This makes very good sense in connection with the following clause, "and that your fruit should abide."

(29) 16 8 *δικαιοσύνη* in the sense of 'justification, salvation.' In this Hebraistic and Pauline interpretation Montgomery (p. 29) follows W. H. P. Hatch (*Harvard Theological Review* XIV. 103 ff).

(30) 16 17 *Εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*. Here, Montgomery observes (p. 17), *ἐκ* is used like the Semitic מִן partivive.

(31) 17 12 *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*. As the original of this phrase Montgomery (p. 16) suggests the Old Testament expression, "son of Belial," though it is not translated in this way in the LXX. Indeed exactly this expression does not occur in the LXX. In Is. 57 4 יִלְדֵי פֶשַׁע is rendered *τέκνα ἀπωλείας*. In Proverbs 24 23 *υἱός* and *ἀπωλείας* happen to occur together, but there *ἀπωλείας* is governed by *ἐκτός*. Whether or not Montgomery's interpretation is correct, the form of the expression is unmistakably Semitic. Deiss-

mann (*Bible Studies* 161, *apud* Howard, p. 411) accepts the metaphorical use of *υἱός* or *τέκνον* with a genitive as translation-Greek in the gospels and explains other instances in the New Testament as "analogical formations."

(32) 18 37 *σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι.* The Synoptic parallels have *σὺ λέγεις* alone. A good example of this expression in Aramaic may be found in Marshall's *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Palestinian Talmud*: אתון אמריתון (p. 58, line 1). Incidentally, the construction of the latter part of this verse (*εἰς τοῦτο…,ἵνα…*) has a striking parallel in the Syriac *Teaching of the Apostle Addai*: ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܫܬܕܪܬ ܠܗܪܟܐ ܕܐܐܡܪ ܘܐܠܦ (Brockelmann's *Chrestomathy*, p. 17, lines 18f).

(33) 20 10 *ἀπῆλθον… πρὸς αὐτούς.* This does not mean, as Bernard interprets it (*ICC*), "to their lodgings," in spite of the parallel he cites from Josephus (*Ant.* VIII. iv. 6). It is the familiar Aramaic 'ethical dative,' especially common with verbs of going (*cf.* the example given above under No. 6).

Some of these instances of particular expressions are not of great importance, but many of them are very striking, and the presence of so many characteristic Aramaic idioms is decidedly significant. All of them may be—and are by Montgomery, Allis, Driver, and Howard—attributed to 'thinking in Aramaic,' or at least to lack of familiarity with literary Greek and a tendency therefore to fall into the idioms of the writer's native tongue. As Burney puts it, such expressions, together with a general lack of Biblicisms, show that the author was a man "who either actually wrote in Aramaic, or whose mind was so moulded by Aramaic idiom that his Greek perforce reflected it" (p. 17). While arguing for translation in John, Burney (pp. 18f) is inclined to attribute the Aramaisms of Mark to the effect of the author's native idiom on his Greek style. By this judgment, as Torrey says (p. 331), he "saws deeply into the butt end of the limb on which he is sitting." It is hardly fair, therefore, to accuse him, as Driver does (p. 8), of not considering how far the use of an acquired language may be affected by an original language.

Schuchart's study of this question is cited by Driver as showing that a second language learned in childhood is not much influenced by the native tongue, but when a language is acquired in later life it is "forced into the mould of the mother tongue." Even so the influence is less evident in syntax than in vocabulary. So it is,says Driver, with John; but surely it is not true that John's vocabulary is more Aramaic than his syntax! An objective standard for determining to what extent and in just what ways an Aramaic writer's native idiom might show through his Greek is not available. The nearest parallels would seem to be Josephus and Paul. The former, however, by his own account, had expert help in weeding out barbarisms from his Greek. Paul's style exhibits here and there an occasional Semitism, but nothing like the degree of Semitic influence shown by the expressions which have been quoted from John. Yet Paul doubtless knew Greek from childhood, while the Fourth Evangelist may have learned it at a more nature age. However that may be, individuals differ widely in their ability to assimilate a foreign idiom.

The relative strength of the argument for the hypothesis of 'thinking in Aramaic' and that for translation cannot be discussed until the evidence for translation has been reviewed. The Semitisms given thus far, being susceptible to another explanation, cannot be counted as such evidence. It may not be amiss, however, to remark that all of them *may* be due to translation. If there are other phenomena which cannot be attributed to any other cause, the argument for translation will not be weakened but confirmed by the evidence of Semitic influence given in the preceding pages.

Before taking up this question we may briefly note another possibility.

V. Palestinian Greek

Some if not all of the Aramaisms noted above may have been used in the colloquial Greek of Palestine in the first century. Aside from the ambiguous evidence of the New Testament itself, nothing is known of the vocabulary or syntax of bilingual Jews in the apostolic age. On general principles it is not unlikely that there was a more or less strongly Semitized dialect or *patois* current among those Jews who had close contact with Gentiles. The possibility that the Greek of the Fourth Gospel may represent such a dialect, while often casually suggested, has not received much serious attention. Driver seems to have it in mind, though he does not clearly distinguish it from the theory of thinking in Aramaic. In fact it practically amounts to the same thing, so far as the interpretation of the evidence is concerned, and is inherently much less likely. We may dismiss it with a pertinent and vigorous comment made by Professor Torrey in a personal letter:[*] "If any one will show me a great literary work in Pennsylvania Dutch, employing an extensive and learned English vocabulary always correctly used, I shall be willing to talk with him."

VI. Translation

The evidence thus far considered is ambiguous. Some kind of strong Semitic influence is abundantly manifest, but just what kind of influence it was is not so clear. Some of the Semitisms presented in the foregoing sections are such as might result from close acquaintance with the LXX. Many more might be due to composition by an Aramaic-speaking writer relatively unfamiliar with Greek. Conceivably, though not probably, they might even be the marks of a peculiar Semitized Greek dialect. All of the phenomena, however, might with at least equal probability be ascribed to translation from an Aramaic document. Even the expressions which can be paralleled in Greek writings of the period *may* here be the result of literal translation, since at best they are questionable Greek, while in Aramaic they are normal idioms. We have now to ask whether there is any evidence which cannot be explained except by the hypothesis of translation, and also whether there is any definite evidence against this hypothesis.

One thing is certain. If there has been translation, it has been well done. Driver is quite right in saying that the gospel is "written in a style by no means devoid of literary grace and entirely free from the bald and jejune style, as well as from the gross blunders of the LXX" (p. 8). Driver does not mean that the Greek of the Fourth Gospel is of a high literary order, for, as we shall see, he considers it the work of a man of little culture. His point is simply that the language is not crude nor ungrammatical. Torrey says of John's Greek, "It is decidedly less awkward than the typical renderings of Semitic originals. The style, so remarkably simple and clear, disarms suspicion; and the diction is generally free from barbarisms, so that it is difficult to convict the writer of clear offences against current Greek usage" (p. 306). In other words, the translation, if translation it be, is a good one.

This fact must be kept in mind in estimating the significance of the Semitisms we have noted. The strength of the argument for translation is not a matter of the relative frequency with which these Semitisms occur. Howard, to be sure, says (p. 480) that a lack of Semitic constructions tells against translation, whereas "the repetition of a solitary Semitism" may betray the "Semitic mind of the writer." But a translation may be more or less literal as well as more or less accurate, and there are many different degrees of familiarity with a language and ability to write in it idiomatically. In the discussion of our subject at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature last December Professor B. W. Bacon remarked that Semitisms in a Greek writing represent only the remnant of the Semitic idiom which has survived in the new Greek medium, and in view of the abundant opportunities for alteration both in translation and transmission the significant fact is that *any* traces of Semitic origin have remained. The most decisive evidence of translation, therefore, as Torrey says (p. 321), "is to be sought in the stray solecism rather than in the ninety and nine classical idioms which need no justification."

John's Semitisms, however, are by no means few or rare. In free composition such a high proportion of Semitisms as we find in John would strongly indicate a lack of education in the writer. Driver sees this. Burney has proved, he says (p. 8), not only that the Fourth Evangelist thought in Aramaic, but also "that he was probably a man of comparatively little education." The peculiarities of his language are signs of his "elementary culture." In a translation, however, no such conclusion would be justified. What is barbarous in Greek is quite correct in Aramaic. A literal translation of the finest writing makes a sorry showing in the new language. Even the best of translators, consciously endeavoring to produce an idiomatic rendering, is sure to put down some things which he would not think of writing in a composition of his own.

Certainly Burney had no idea that he was demonstrating any lack of culture in the writer of our gospel. On the contrary, he objects to J. H. Moulton's "arguing from the epistolary style of an Egyptian pig-merchant or the speech of an English rustic to the style of the Fourth Gospel" (p. 6). "The theory of elementary culture which satisfactorily explains the style of the former," he says, "is ill applied to a work which in thought, scheme, and execution takes rank as the greatest literary production of the New Testament, and the greatest religious monument of all time." Torrey, who also regards the writer of the gospel as a man of "learning and literary skill," quotes with incredulity the curious conclusion of Moulton: "The linguistic evidence all goes to show that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man who, while cultured to the last degree, wrote Greek after the fashion of a man of quite elementary attainment" (*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II, p. 33, *apud* Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 324).

This raises an important question. Is it likely that such a book as the Fourth Gospel would come from a man who wrote this kind of Greek? Is the book one that a man of little culture would have written? In other words, does it show its author to have been "a man of comparatively little education," as Driver says, or one who was, as Moulton says, "cultured to the last degree?" We have seen that John's Greek, though often unidiomatic, is not incorrect. Would not the language of an uneducated writer be ungrammatical as well as inelegant? If we assume that the Evangelist had just enough education to write correctly, but in a style more colloquial than literary, what shall we say of his thought? At the December meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature Professor A. D. Nock said that our writer had probably read few books but had thought much. That may be true, but if he had read little, he must have conversed much with men of learning, for he shows no slight acquaintance with the thought of his day. Doubtless his depth of thought and literary skill were the result of native genius and spiritual experience rather than of formal education, yet he knew how to establish contacts with the thinking of his readers. Perhaps his knowledge of such conceptions as the Logos was not greater than any man accustomed to the conversation of thinking people might have had. Certainly we need not follow Moffatt in saying that the evangelist was "acquainted with the writings of Herakleitus" (*Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 525). His culture, however, is exhibited not merely in the use of philosophical terms. Moffatt (*op. cit.*, p. 523) calls attention to the "blend of subtlety and simplicity" in his literary method. His acquaintance with Jewish thought, moreover, is clearly manifest, and this is as truly cultural as a knowledge of Hellenistic speculation. In spite of the uncultured Greek in which his thought is presented to us, the writer of this book was by no means *ἀγράμματος καὶ ἰδιώτης* (Acts 4 13). His thought seems too advanced for the style in which it is expressed. But if the gospel as we have it is a translation, the language of the original may very well have been in keeping with the thought and with the skill of presentation in other respects.

All this applies to the evidences of Semitic influence already presented. There are also passages which cannot be attributed to thinking in Aramaic, but which can be very plausibly explained by the hypothesis of translation.

(1) *Omission of the article before a genitive*, 1 49; 4 5; 5 27, 29; 6 68; 9 5 (contrast 1 4; 8 12). This would be a natural result of the literal translation of a noun in the construct state. Howard (p. 431) suggests that the anarthrous nouns in 6 68 and 9 5 have a qualitative force, but this would not explain the other passages. Torrey says (p. 323) that this construction could be easily avoided, and the use of the article in the gospel is generally idiomatic, but that in these places we have distinct traces of the Semitic idiom. Unless a translator systematically followed a uniform procedure, he might easily insert the article in some passages and not in others. Furthermore, the construct state is not so common in Aramaic as in Hebrew and where the article appears in the Greek the Aramaic may have had the determinate form of the noun followed by דִּי.

(2) 8 44 ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. To what does αὐτοῦ refer? Montgomery (p. 21) makes the striking suggestion that the Semitic original may have read, "He is a son of the lie and its father." The translator then gave an idiomatic rendering of the first expression, but reproduced the second literally. Montgomery himself does not regard this as conclusive evidence of translation, but it is at least as good as any other explanation that has been offered for this puzzling verse.

In addition to these passages for which the theory of translation gives a reasonable explanation, Burney and Torrey cite a number of instances of what they believe to be mistranslations, and both of them regard these mistranslations as making the argument for an Aramaic original conclusive. Howard accepts the principle, saying, "The decisive factor in the establishment of such a theory is a few instances of almost certain mistranslation" (p. 483). He denies, however, that the cases given are convincing. Considerable skepticism on the subject has been aroused by the fact that Torrey rejects many of Burney's alleged mistranslations while offering others of his own. It seems to be forgotten that many of Burney's instances are regarded by Torrey as "quite certain." As for the rest, the fault unquestionably lies in an excess of zeal on Burney's part. His argument would have been stronger if he had been more careful to guard himself against over-statement. For myself I must confess that an examination of the evidence has compelled me to reject all of the examples which Torrey rejects and also some that he accepts.

As regards the general probability of mistranslation Driver (p. 7) says that ancient translators fall into two groups, those who translate very freely and those whose renderings are, like the LXX, slavishly literal. The Greek of John, he adds, belongs to neither class: it is good post-classical Greek, with few downright errors. Why, therefore, should the writer, who in other passages shows himself familiar with idiomatic usage, blunder in a few places? Over against this may be placed the statement of Torrey: "Close translation, in any age of the world, is a highly difficult task; and the interpreter would be more than human who could render twenty-one chapters of *unpointed* Aramaic text into Greek without making many slips" (p. 327).

But Driver also urges (pp. 6f) that serious errors would not have been possible while Greek and Aramaic were both living languages and within the thirty or forty years which, at most, could have intervened between the composition of the gospel (75—80 A.D. according to Burney) and its translation (not later than 125 or even 110 A.D.). Especially if the writer was still alive when the translation was made, and if he had learned Greek himself in the meantime, the translation would have been referred to him for correction, while if we do not find much evidence of mistranslation the probability is that the author wrote in Greek while thinking in Aramaic. Here and at one or two other points it is hard to avoid the feeling that Driver unconsciously has the son of Zebedee in mind, and therefore accepts too readily conclusions which are in accord with the traditional view of authorship. If this suspicion is unfounded, at any rate his reasoning is curiously circular. Under the circumstances, he says, a translation would have been free from errors and might even have been revised by the author; yet he also says that if there are no serious errors there probably was no translation! In any case we do not need to find many mistranslations. A very few mistakes, naturally accounted for, would constitute strong evidence.

But what shall we consider satisfactory proof of mistranslation? Howard rejects the evidence of Burney and Torrey because "such highly competent Semitists as Père Lagrange and Mr. G. R. Driver recognize that even the most difficult passage can be understood without recourse to this kind of treatment" (p. 483). Similarly Allis (p. 537) insists that mistranslation is proved only if it is the only possible solution of a difficulty in the text. In other words, if a passage is at all intelligible as it stands, it has not been mistranslated. But why should a translator make an impossible rendering? Except in the comparatively rare instances where, in despair, he renders literally a passage unintelligible in the original, only carelessness or incompetence on his part could produce such evidence of mistranslation as Allis and Howard require. Now, whatever our

Fourth Gospel may or may not be, it is not a careless nor an incompetent translation. Wherever, therefore, a given rendering has sufficient plausibility to have been made by the translator, a different interpretation cannot be considered necessary. Hence the sort of proof demanded is in the nature of the case impossible.

Herein lies the essential elusiveness of our problem. Aside from such stupid and obvious blunders as occur in the LXX but never in John, I cannot see how any case of mistranslation can ever be entirely certain. But, admitting the impossibility of attaining perfect certainty, we may yet find a distinct balance of probability. If the instances of mistranslation given by Burney and Torrey do not convince us. we may rightly say with Howard (p. 484) that translation has not been established, but it does not follow that the contrary has been proved or that translation is improbable. Why should the theory of translation be so stubbornly resisted? Allis feels bound to oppose it because it implies that our Greek gospel is not directly and infallibly inspired, but surely most of us do not need to be reminded that in any case the vast majority of Christians have always been dependent upon fallible translations for their knowledge of the way of life. Certainly there is nothing inherently improbable in the hypothesis. Furthermore, as Professor J. H. Ropes observed in the course of our discussion last December, the theory of thinking in Aramaic requires proof no less than the theory of translation. It is poor logic to assume the former as established if the latter cannot be definitely proved. Yet one or the other must be true.

Torrey claims for his examples of mistranslation that "in each instance a serious difficulty in the traditional reading finds its obvious and easy solution in the Aramaic hypothesis. In no one of the passages discussed is it necessary to suppose carelessness or obtuseness on the part of either copyist or translator, or to postulate singular usage." In general we may say that to establish a reasonable degree of probability for an alleged mistranslation involves (1) a serious difficulty in the Greek (though not necessarily a reading incapable of any other explanation), (2) a plausible explanation in Aramaic, and (3) a natural explanation of the mistake, not presupposing "carelessness or obtuseness" or "singular usage." We may also add that (4) the supposed original must be distinctly more probable than the interpretation given in the text. This does not mean, however, that it must be smoother or more commonplace. A consideration of Burney's supposed mistranslations suggests that sometimes he might better have applied the textual critic's principle of preferring the harsher reading.

Nothing would be gained by discussing in detail every alleged example of mistranslation. Only the more probable instances need be presented here. If they are not convincing, certainly the rest are not. If they are, the case would not be strengthened by adding more dubious examples.

(1) *Mistranslation of* דְ (דִּי). Burney cites many passages in which he believes that דְ, which serves in Aramaic both as an indeclinable relative pronoun and as a conjunction of many meanings, has been taken in the wrong sense. For the most part the interpretations he suggests are no better than the readings of the text, yet it is remarkable that he has found so many cases where the substitution of the relative pronoun for *ἵνα* or *ὅτι*, or of *ὅτι* or *ἵνα* for the relative pronoun, produces a perfectly natural meaning. The Aramaic particle would often have just such ambiguity. To quote a typical example, in 5 7, *ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα … βάλῃ με*, Burney (p. 75) asserts that *ἵνα* represents דְ, which should have been taken as the relative pronoun. Now if there was an Aramaic original with דְ where the Greek has *ἵνα*, it might very naturally have been rendered, as Burney proposes, "I have no man *who* … shall put me into the pool." To say, however, as Burney does, that this is the "obvious meaning" of the Aramaic does not help matters, for then why did the Greek translator go out of his way to avoid the obvious? The most that can be said in this and in most of the other instances is that the Aramaic was ambiguous, and that the rendering preferred by Burney would have been justifiable. But in such a case there is no clear evidence of translation.

Some of the examples, however, are more arresting than this. In 9 17, *τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;* Burney holds that the Aramaic writer intended דְ as a relative pronoun: "What sayest thou of him *who* opened thine eyes?" This still falls short of a convincing case. As Allis suggests (p. 543), the question may be divided: "What sayest thou of him? That he opened thine eyes?" For this construction Allis gives close parallels, including John 11 56. The alternative that *τί* may here mean 'why' is inadmissable, because then the man's reply would mean, "Because he is a prophet," but it was not because Jesus was a prophet that the man said he had opened his eyes; it was because Jesus had opened his eyes that the man said he was a prophet.

A much more impressive case is 8 45, *ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι.* Here both Burney (p. 101) and Montgomery (p. 21) suggest that the relative pronoun should have been used instead of *ὅτι*. This presupposes a distinctly idiomatic Aramaic sentence, with a *nominativus pendens* at the beginning and a redundant pronoun (or suffix) at the end. Allis (p. 543) prefers the present reading: "it is just *because* the Lord speaks the *truth*," he says, "that the children of lies do not believe." But Driver (pp. 2f) and Howard (pp. 436f) tacitly admit mistranslation here when they say that the evangelist himself was mentally translating the words of a man who spoke in Aramaic. This argument we shall have to consider again, but unless we postulate such mental translation of a saying heard in Aramaic, Burney's case here is a strong one.

In two passages Burney believes that דְּ has been correctly taken as the relative pronoun but has been mistakenly translated in the wrong number or gender. In 10 29, *ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστιν*, where Burney reads *ὃς* for *ὅ*, this is not so certain as in 17 11f, *τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,... ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς κτλ.* Here the parallel expressions of vv. 2 and 24 and 6 37, 39 show plainly that the relative pronoun should refer to *αὐτούς*, not to *ὀνόματι* as it does in the present text. Yet it was quite natural for the translator to render it as referring to the nearest noun. Torrey (p. 328) pronounces Burney's interpretations of both these passages "quite certain."

(2) *Other conjunctions.* 12 7 *ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα ... τηρήσῃ αὐτό.* Bernard (*I. C. C.*, *in loc.*) takes this to mean, "Let her alone, in order that she may keep it," *i. e.*, let her keep the rest of it. Torrey.

however, obtains a much better meaning (p. 343). The original, he thinks, had the idiomatic "imperative of שבק followed by an imperfect tense *without* a conjunction." This meant, "Let her alone; *should she keep it* for the day of my burial?" But it was ambiguous, and "in the (usual) absence of any particle of interrogation the rendering of our Greek would be more natural."

4 6 *ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς . . . ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ.* 13 25 *ἀναπεσὼν ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.* The adverb *οὕτως* in these verses has given commentators considerable trouble. Its omission in many manuscripts suggests that it was felt to be awkward. Montgomery (pp. 21 f.) suggests that in 4 6 it might be a corruption of *αὐτῷ*, the idiomatic 'ethical dative' of Aramaic, but, since such corruption would not have occurred in both of the above passages, it is more likely that the original Aramaic was *kadu* (*kad hu*), which was often used as an equivalent of the Latin *iam* and would be approximately represented by *οὕτως*. Torrey regards *οὕτως* as a mistaken rendering of בְּכֵן, meaning 'therefore, accordingly.' Incidentally we may notice that the use of *ἐπί* here corresponds exactly to the Semitic עַל, as in Genesis 24 13 etc.

20 17 *οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πάτερα.* This clause is believed by Torrey (pp. 342 f.) to be a literal translation of כדי עד לא סלקת לאבא, which should have been taken in the sense, "Before I ascend to the Father," and which belonged with the following clause, "go unto my brethren." This clause was introduced in Aramaic by the idiomatic, superfluous ו (represented by *δέ*), and it was this which led to the mistranslation. Assuming that the ו indicated the beginning of a new sentence, the translator connected the preceding clause with what went before and rendered it literally, word for word, taking כדי in a causal instead of a temporal sense, and thus producing the reading of our Greek text. A good example of the redundant ו after a temporal clause introduced by בְּטֶרֶם may be seen in Ex. 1 19: "Before the midwife comes to them, (and) they gsve birth." Curiously enough the LXX takes the בְּטֶרֶם clause with what precedes it (reading *τίκτουσι* for חָיוֹת) and adds, quite literally but with no attempt at making sense, *καὶ ἔτικτον.*

(3) *Indeclinable* כלא *translated in the wrong number or gender.* 6 37, 39, 17 2 Πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι, etc. Burney claims that πᾶν ὅ represents כֹּלָּא דְּ, meaning "all who," Torrey (p. 328) says that the Greek expression, while defensible as a translation, would not have been used in free composition. As against this, Howard (p. 437), in connection with the relative pronoun in 10 29 and 17 11 f (*v. s.*, p. 129), cites 1 John 5 4 as showing that πᾶν was used in a collective sense. It may be, however, that the writer of the epistle was influenced by the usage of the gospel, especially if he was himself the translator of the gospel.

2 15 πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας. Of this passage Torrey says (in a letter to the writer) that the evangelist would not have represented Jesus as using his whip on 'all the people' in the temple. In the original he drove out "all.... both the cattle and the sheep": כֹּלָּא הַנְפֵּק מִן הֵיכְלָא וְאִמְּרַיָּא וְתוֹרַיָּא. The Greek, therefore, should read πάντα instead of πάντας. As showing the need of emendation Prof. Torrey adds, "Note that Blass cancels πάντας, while Wellhausen cancels (drives out) the sheep and cattle!"

2 24 διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας. Here too Torrey holds that πάντα "makes a better verse," and in support of this he cites 21 17, πάντα σὺ οἶδας.

(4) *Misinterpretation of Aramaic words having more than one meaning.* 8 56 Ἀβαὰμ ... ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη. The use of ἵνα after ἠγαλλιάσατο is declared by Burney (p. 111) to be quite unwarranted by Greek usage. If it means "rejoiced to see," he adds, this makes the following clause tautologous. What we should expect is "longed to see," and the verb ܣܘܚ, used by the Peshitto to translate ἠγαλλιάσατο here, actually has this meaning in addition to the one represented by the Greek verb. Unfortunately the verb mentioned is not found in Western Aramaic. Burney says, "there is not reason why it should not have been in use," but Torrey objects (p. 329) that if it had been used it would not have been misunderstood. This is one of the cases in which Torrey offers a different explanation of his own, involving a slight corruption in the Aramaic text rather than

the use of an ambiguous word. The verb represented by *ἠγαλλιάσατο*, says Torrey (pp. 340f), was בָּע, the regular Aramaic equivalent of this Greek verb and of the Hebrew גִּיל. The original Aramaic text, however, read בְּעָא אַבְרָהָם, "Abraham prayed." The א at the beginning of the name, together with the fact that the meaning, 'Abraham exulted,' was so natural, caused the omission of the final א of the verb. Howard, though remarking that Lagrange questions the form בָּע, admits that Torrey's suggestion is an improvement on that of Burney. With regard to the form of the verb we may remark that according to M. Jastrow's Dictionary בְּעֵי (= בְּעָא) means 'to pray' and בְּעִי (= בּוּע) means 'to burst forth, shout, rejoice.' In the unpointed text, of course, these would be identical. In just what dialects or periods these forms were used is another question, but the coincidence is remarkable, to say the least.

11 33 *Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν ... ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν.* 38 *Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον.* The Greek, says Torrey (p. 338), can only mean "was very angry." Bauer's explanation, that lamentation in the presence of Jesus insulted him, presents a picture of Jesus which "is intolerable, since it is untrue." The verb in the original was רגז, which in Aramaic and Syriac usually denotes wrath, but occasionally has the meaning which it has in the Hebrew of 2 Samuel 19 1 (18 33), where it is used of David's grief for Absalom. This was the meaning intended here in John (note *ἐτάραξεν* in 33), but the translator naturally took the word in its usual sense. Torrey believes that similar mistranslations explain the use of *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* in Matthew 9 30 and Mark 1 43, and the phrase *μετ' ὀργῆς* (בִּרְגֵז) in Mark 3 5 (which, we may observe, is coupled with *συνλυπούμενος*). Torrey's interpretation here relieves a difficulty, offers an explanation which affords a better meaning, and also shows how the mistake came to be made — an ideal case of mistranslation.

(5) *Wrong pointing of the Aramaic.* 7 38 *ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ.* The *γραφή* here quoted has never been satisfactorily identified. Burney (pp. 109–111) suggests a blending of Joel 3 18

(Heb. 4 18) and Zechariah 14 8 employing the word מַעְיָן, 'fountain,' which was read by the Greek translator as מְעַין, 'bowels, belly.' Driver (p. 6 n), following G. B. Gray, objects that *αὐτοῦ* presupposes a suffix (or דִּילֵהּ), which would have made the confusion impossible. He also suggests that there was a word meaning 'belly' which was spelled and pronounced exactly like the word for fountain, and which therefore might have been misunderstood by Jesus' immediate hearers. Torrey (p. 329) rejects Burney's theory and suggests instead of it (pp. 339f) that the original was a loose quotation of Zechariah 14 8 using מִגַּוַּהּ, 'out of the midst of her,' for Zechariah's 'out from Jerusalem.' The translator assumed the vocalization מִגַּוֵּהּ, and since the Aramaic word was often used of human beings in the sense of *κοιλία*, the present text was the natural result. This gives a plausible reason for the mistake, but the point of the quotation is not clear, and it is hard to see why the original writer should have substituted 'her' for 'Jerusalem.'

14 2 *εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· ὅτι πορεύομαι.* As the original of this Torrey (p. 341) proposes ולא אמר אנה לכון די אזל. The first word, which the translator naturally understood as וְלָא (*εἰ δὲ μή*), was in fact וְלֵא, 'it is fitting, necessary,' and the saying was practically identical with 16 7, which is correctly translated *συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω.* This is an excellent example of turning difficult Greek back into simple Aramaic, with a natural explanation of the error. The parallel in 16 7 shows that the translator was familiar with this use of וְלֵא, but the parenthetic "I tell you" may have misled him here. Why אמר אנה should have been rendered *εἶπον ἂν* is puzzling, but certainly it would be natural to take the clause די אזל as the object of אמר.

(6) *Textual corruption in the Aramaic.* These cases are not strictly mistranslations, since they assume that the translator rendered correctly the Aramaic text as it came to him.

1 28 Βηθανία. This, says Torrey (p. 343), is unquestionably the original Greek reading, but the alternative reading, Βηθαβαρά, preserves the correct historical tradition of the locality. Confusion between ב and נ and between ר and י, such as may be paralleled in Aramaic inscriptions, caused בית עברא to be read בית עניא.

7 3 *ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ⸂ἔργα σου.* Torrey considers this "one of the countless cases of omission (accidental or mistaken) of the conjunction ו" (p. 340). The Aramaic read, "that they" — the indefinite third person plural, a characteristic Aramaic idiom — "may see thy disciples *and* thy works." But since "thy disciples" immediately followed the verb, it was taken as the subject, and the conjunction was then dropped. This is not one of the strongest examples, yet it has sufficient likelihood to deserve inclusion in the evidence for translation.

7 8 *ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην.* For this passage Torrey (in a letter already quoted) suggests one of his most ingenious reconstructions. Accepting *οὐκ* as the original reading instead of *οὔπω* (which, however, shows that the copyists felt the difficulty of attributing to Jesus a statement which his conduct at once belied), Torrey suggests as the original of the saying, אֲנָה לָא סָלֵק לִי עַד אֲרֵי זִמְנִי עַד לָא שְׁלֵם. This is beautifully idiomatic Aramaic. The phrase, "to the feast," at the end of the preceding clause, caused the words, לִי עַד אֲרֵי, to be read, לְעֵידָא דִּי, thus producing the reading of the Greek text. Since ר and ד are often indistinguishable, the only change involved is the transposition of י and ע. Stronger evidence of translation than this could hardly be desired.

14 31 *Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.* After these words, as Torrey observes (p. 341), no one arises or goes out. Dislocation is commonly suspected, but except for these three words the connection between chapters 14 and 15 is perfect. The original text, Torrey suggests, read, "I will no longer speak much with you, . . . but in order that the world may know that I love the Father, and that as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do, I will arise and go hence," i. e. ודי ינדע עלמא די ... כן עבד אנא אֱקוּם וְאֵזֵל מִכָּה. The last three words were altered to קוּמוּ נֵאזֵל מכה by a copyist whose eye caught the characters קומו, and who "failed to recognize the euphemism, 'go hence,' with the redundant 'arise.'" This interpretation affords an apodosis for *ἀλλ' ἵνα*, but there are other examples of *ἀλλ' ἵνα* with ellipsis. In view of other phenomena in the gospel, moreover, the dislocation of chapter 14 is no less likely than the corruption of the text in this verse, for the verse

as it stands would be very natural before 18 1. The case for translation, therefore, is not so strong here as in the foregoing example.

In two or three of the foregoing instances we have noted that Driver is content to point out that the mistranslations are in *ipsissima verba*, *i.e.* in sayings of Jesus or of others who presumably spoke in Aramaic. Driver's conclusion (pp. 6, 8), in which he is followed by Howard (p. 484), is that mistranslation in these passages does not imply the existence of a written gospel in Aramaic, or even of written *Logia*, but only a mental translation of sayings which the evangelist had heard or had received by tradition. Now if it is admitted that there are mistranslations in some of these passages, the question whether the whole book, a written source, or an oral tradition has been translated may be left to be discussed by itself, but it is important to note that in these passages at least the evangelist was not composing freely in Greek. Let that be accepted as established, and the question of translation then hinges upon the question of the sources of the gospel.

VII. Evidence Against Translation

Few of those who have written upon the subject have stopped to ask what definite evidence there may be against the hypothesis of translation. Allis says explicitly, "... the burden of proof rests with those who accept the theory of an Aramaic original of the Fourth Gospel. It is for them to prove this thesis. It is not the duty of the objector to disprove it." If our attitude is one of loyally resisting an attack upon the citadel of faith, such a statement may be justified. From the point of view of mathematical demonstration, also, there may be some excuse for it. But if we seek without bias to determine what is probable, the question of negative evidence is one that cannot be ignored.

So far as I have been able to discover, there are only two arguments against translation.

(1) *Identity of style in the gospel and the First Epistle of John.* Bernard (*I. C. C.*, vol. I, p. lxvii) urges this as an obstacle to the translation hypothesis. He holds that the writer of the gospel and the writer of the epistle were the same, and since no one has

claimed that the epistle is a translation, it follows that the gospel too was composed in Greek. Quite apart from the question of translation, however, there are competent authorities who deny the identity of authorship of the two books. Moffatt, for example, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, while emphasizing "the delicacy of the problem," reaches this conclusion: "Upon the whole, however, the lines of evidence appear to indicate that the epistle came from a writer who, while belonging to the general 'Johannine' school of thought and feeling, occupied slightly different ground from that of the author of the Fourth gospel" (p. 592). To the arguments based on comparison of the two Greek writings may be added the further fact that very few of the distinctly Semitic peculiarities of the gospel reappear in the epistle. Those which do are those which we have found to be defensible by *Koine* usage, or they may be attributed to the influence of the Greek gospel itself. For example, πιστεύειν εἰς occurs in 1 John 5 10, 13, but elsewhere in the epistle, 3 23 and 4 1, and even in the midst of 5 10 itself, πιστεύειν is followed by the dative without a preposition. A generous use of personal pronouns and of ἐκεῖνος, an unclassical but distinctly Johannine use of ἵνα, 5 3 (cp. also the elliptic ἀλλ' ἵνα, 2 19), and frequent parataxis may also be noted as having a Semitic flavor. All of the affinities between gospel and epistle, however, in style as well as in thought, are naturally accounted for if we suppose that the writer of the epistle was the translator or redactor of the gospel, or both.

(2) *Literary dependence on Greek writings.* Parallels in thought and language have been pointed out between John and Philo, Josephus, Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, Enoch, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Synoptic Gospels.

In the case of Philo, it should be noted that acquaintance with his ideas does not necessarily involve literary dependence. Probably the teaching of Philo was known in Palestine and throughout the Diaspora, and his ideas were frequently discussed in Aramaic as well as Greek. Many people who cannot read German are talking about relativity today. How well the Fourth Evangelist actually was acquainted with the thought of Philo, therefore, is a question into which we need not go. The question of direct dependence hinges upon a careful comparison of the parallels. These are much too numerous to be presented here, but the work has been thoroughly done. Bernard, who certainly is not prejudiced in favor of the Aramaic origin of the gospel, concludes after a careful examination that a direct connection "cannot be regarded as certain." (*I. C. C.*, vol. I, pp. xciii f). Examination of the parallels which have been cited by the commentators shows that in most cases there is no probability of connection, in others it is possible but hardly likely, and in no case is there a strong probability of anything more than a vague allusion.

Between our gospel and Josephus there are a few quite striking parallels. They are well presented by Moffatt (*op. cit.*, p. 29). Their force, however, depends largely upon minute verbal echoes of scattered passages from the *Antiquities*. The strongest case for dependence is in John 4 6 and *Ant.* ii. 11. 1. Josephus is telling the story of Exodus 2 15, and says that Moses, arriving near a city, *καθεσθεὶς ἐπί τινος φρέατος ἐκ τοῦ κόπου καὶ τῆς ταλαιπορίας ἠρέμει, μεσημβρίας οὔσης*. John's account of Jesus' coming to the well is something like this, but his diction is about as different as it could be in the expression of such similar ideas: *κεκοπιακώς* instead of *ἐκ τοῦ κόπου*, *ὁδοιπορίας* instead of *ταλαιπορίας*, *ἐκαθέζετο* instead of *καθεσθείς*, *πηγῇ* instead of *φρέατος*, and *ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη* instead of *μεσημβρίας οὔσης*. It is true that in ii. 15. 3 Josephus (speaking of the passage of the Red Sea) has *ὑπὸ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κεκοπωμένων* and in the same passage uses the word *θρέμμα*, which John has in 4 12 and which occurs only here in the New Testament and never in the LXX. John also uses *φρέαρ* in 4 11, 12, but so does the LXX in Exodus 2 15. If there is any connection here at all, it is probably indirect, and the differences are just such as might be expected in variant translations of a common Aramaic source.

Some kind of connection between John and Sirach seems not improbable, but the verbal resemblance is not sufficiently close to indicate at all clearly that it was the Greek translation of Sirach which was used by the evangelist. Cp. John 1 14 and Sirach 24 8, John 4 14, 6 27, 35, 7 37 f. and Sirach 24 21, John 14 23 and Sirach 2 15.

The parallels between John and the Wisdom of Solomon are many and sometimes impressive; here again, however, we find similar ideas with considerable difference in expression. Also, in several instances, the same ideas are found in other writings too. The two authors (assuming the integrity of the Wisdom of Solomon) belong to the same world of thought, but a direct connection in the Greek is not evident.

Probably there is some connection, direct or indirect, between Enoch and John, but that the two are related in the Greek cannot be shown. The parallels seem to indicate rather a common acquaintance with the same currents of thought.

Between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel there is no connection apparent beyond the fact that both reflect to some extent the language and conceptions of Alexandrian philosophy.

A much closer relationship certainly exists between John and the Synoptic Gospels, in particular Mark and Luke. The parallels are well presented in the commentaries and New Testament Introductions and need not be repeated here. Macgregor (*Moffatt New Testament Commentary* on John, p. lxv) says, "The Gospel's close, sometimes even verbal, dependence upon the Greek Gospel of Mark would seem to weigh against the theory that it was actually written in Aramaic." But the question of an Aramaic original of Mark is still open, and the contacts between John and Mark are not closer than two translations of a common original or two lines of oral tradition might be. If the translator of John was acquainted with Mark and Luke in Greek, this might account for some of the coincidences in diction. The case for the dependence of the Greek John upon the Greek Mark, and perhaps on Luke also, is a strong one. It is the most formidable argument now in the field against the theory of translation. In view of the considerations just mentioned, however, it falls somewhat short of being entirely conclusive.

Conclusions

To sum up the result of our investigation, it is evident that Burney has considerably over-stated his case. Torrey also, though much more cautious, is a bit too confident. Montgomery, on the other hand, seems unnecessarily timid in accepting the implications of his own evidence. The question now appears to be a matter of balancing apparent dependence on the Greek Synoptic Gospels against the almost overwhelming evidence of John's Semitisms and even mistranslations.

The possibility of an intermediate position must not be ignored, in spite of Torrey's condemnation of the phrase "based on Semitic sources" as a "vague and unprofitable formula." Driver and Howard emphasize the fact that most of Burney's mistranslations occur in discourses and conversations, and Macgregor (*op. cit.*, p. lxv) sees in this a suggestion that the discourses alone were translated from an Aramaic draft. Driver himself, as we have seen, attributes the Aramaisms to thinking in Aramaic or to a Palestinian dialect and explains the mistranslations by mental renderings of traditional or remembered sayings. Neither Driver's nor Macgregor's theory, however, accounts for Torrey's mistranslations, some of the strongest of which occur in the narrative *Rahmen* of the discourses.

Macgregor has another suggestion which is more probable (p. lxvi): "If it be held proved that the Gospel was originally written in Aramaic, an attractive theory would be that it was the Redactor who translated it into Greek. Such a theory has the great advantage that it provides a more definite occasion not only for the interpolation of new material, but also for the disturbance of what appears to have been the original order of the text." To the present writer the hypothesis of a Palestinian or Syrian gospel written in Aramaic, with a later Ephesian translation and recension, seems entirely probable.

Obviously further study and discussion are necessary, but the question certainly should not be ignored. My feelings in studying it have sometimes wavered. I have sometimes felt that I should emerge from it a sadder but not a wiser man, and that a definite decision would forever be impossible. But perhaps the situation is not so hopeless, if only a sufficient number of competent investigators will work the thing through, and especially if we can be content with probability instead of certainty.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

CARL H. KRAELING
YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

It is said that any genealogy, if traced back far enough, will reveal at least one rogue in the line of descent. Thus, while the conjectural critic and the student of New Testament Introduction will each need to own among his forebears the heretic Marcion, the *Religionsgeschichtler* who applies his method to the New Testament tradition in general and to the Fourth Gospel in particular, will have humbly to acknowledge as his ultimate spiritual ancestor none other than the most caustic of all ancient critics of Christianity, Celsus. For, according to Origen, Celsus not only considered it probable that large areas of Christian thought were derived from Ophite and Mithraic lore, but also compared the statements of Holy Writ with passages from the Greek philosophers, concluding that "these things were said much better by the Greeks"[1], and that those who spoke of the Christian Son of God as Logos were reasoning sophistically.[2]

While Celsus is the first author to compare Christian and pagan traditions, many centuries passed till further comparisons of the same type were hazarded. One after the other the Christian Platonist, the medieval traditionalist, the protestant biblicist, the pietist and the rationalist were attracted to the Fourth Gospel. It was so easy for them to discover therein echoes of their own religious postulates. The last of the long line of ardent and sympathetic exponents was none other than Schleiermacher, upon whom the speculative interest of the Gospel made a profound impression. Only the approach of Realism and the development of a keen historical perspective were able to produce changes in this situation. Modern comparative study of the Fourth Gospel thus begins in the days when the Tübingen School ventured to apply to Christian history the Hegelian laws of historical development, thereby exposing for the first time the deep cleft that lay between the earlier and the later strata of our New Testament traditions.

---

[1] *Contra Celsum*, VI, 1.

[2] *ibid.*, II, 31.

Although, as a serious enterprise, it really appears for the first time in the Tübingen and post-Tübingen era, the comparative study of the Fourth Gospel has roots that reach back to an earlier day. The first of these roots will be found in the purely humanistic realization, achieved in the sixteenth century, to the effect that the early Christian apologists were subject to influence from Stoic circles. This realization was later extended to cover the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel in the thought of Jean le Clerc and Samuel Crell. The second of the two roots will be found in the works of English and French Deists among whom Dupuis, for one, endeavored to derive the miracle at Cana from Dionysiac prototypes.[3]

I mention these facts because our modern comparative study of the Fourth Gospel reveals the existence of two independent lines of investigation, the one concerned with the person of Christ particularly as represented in the Prologue, the other concerned with the works of Christ, his signs and wonders, as represented in the body of the Gospel.

With the progress made along these two lines of investigation up to and including the year 1923 everyone is more or less familiar. It is well known that at a right early time Philo came to be considered the source and the inspiration of the writer of the Prologue, that ultimately Philo was regarded as inadequate because his Logos is so often merely an expression of divine immanence, that at the turn of the century the Hermetic texts, where Life and Light are associated at least with the Nous from whom the Logos proceeds, were called into play, and that finally even Cornutus with his definitely personified Logos was invoked. But not everyone ready to go to Alexandria and Philo was willing to enter into the sanctuary of Hermes to obtain his Johannine Logos. The result was in the case of some like Sanday and Westcott, a reversal to the anti-speculative derivation of the Prologue, and to the creative Word of the Old Testament, a reversal that has become increasingly unsatisfactory in proportion as the absolute and the cosmic significance of Jn 1 1 and 1 4 respectively have been stressed, and in proportion as the inquiries of Strack-Billerbeck and G. F. Moore have tended to render evanescent the idea of an early Jewish hypostatic Memra. From the decidedly unpleasant dilemma of Hermes-Memra the fertile mind of Rendel Harris developed an escape when it resolved the theology of the Prologue into Wisdom speculation.[4] The significance and the value of this suggestion will be apparent to anyone who has wrestled with the words "tabernacled among us" in Jn 1 14, as applying to the Logos. But Harris' argument has not yet been made entirely cogent, for the Prologue does actually deal with the Logos and the coördination of Logos and Sophia outside of Alexandria is questionable to say the least.

---

[3] Clemen, C., *Primitive Christianity* etc., Edinburgh, 1912, p. 358.

Thus confronted by difficulties on every hand a cautious scholar like Archbishop Bernard will go with Philo so far as he will lead, and will assume that the plus of our Prologue over Philo derives from some vague and ubiquitous influence working in the general direction of, but quite apart from the Hermes speculation.[5] All this may be true enough, but it is at the same time an admission of our inability definitely to identify the origin of the peculiarities of the Johannine Prologue.

The second of the two lines of comparative study of the Fourth Gospel attacks the problem of the narratives. Born of the Deistic interpretation of Scripture this type of inquiry has always been something of an illegitimate child. Beginning with certain vague attempts of Mechler and Hilgenfeld to connect our document with Gnosticism, the inquiry soon turned upon the contentions of Seydel and Bergh van Eysinga, who derived the narratives of the call of Philip and of the woman at the well from Buddhistic parallels, and upon the statements of Robertson and Zimmern who connected the miracle at Cana with Dionysiac rites and the Paraclete with Babylonian deities of intercession respectively.

---

[4] *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel, Cambridge* ,1917; Athena, Sophia and the Logos, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, VII, 1, July 1922, pp. 56—72.

[5] *The Gospel acc. to St. John*, ICC, vol. I, New York, 1929, pp. cxxxviii—cxlvii.

The present century has witnessed at least two monumental efforts in this line of inquiry. The first was Kreyenbühl's *Evangelium der Wahrheit.*[6] It endeavored to show that as the Clementine Literature reflects the struggles of Paul and the Judaists, so the Fourth Gospel echoes the clash of the Ignatian high church and a mystical low church connected ultimately with Magian developments. More significant is the effort made by Grill in his *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*[7] in which, at the hand of painstaking and valuable *Vorstudien* the Gospel was resolved into a mystery document. Its purpose, we are told, was to show that Christianity is the perfect mystery religion of the Dionysiac type.

Neither Kreyenbühl's compendious work nor the second volume of Grill, which appeared as late as 1923, have received much attention. The theories advanced lack the fundamental note of verisimilitude. We must thus conclude that neither of the two lines of inquiry along which the comparative study of the Fourth Gospel proceded prior to 1923 were productive of very definite results. Perhaps the unfortunate division of subject matter and of investigation is partly to blame.

Subsequent to 1923 the comparative study of the Fourth Gospel entered a new phase. It was occasioned by the publication in translation of the Mandaic texts and by Reitzenstein's significant contributions to the interpretation of Manichean and Mandean religious belief.[8] From the late strata of syncretistic tradition Reitzenstein inferred the existence at an early time in the whole of the Near

---

[6] 2 vols., Berlin, 1900—1905.

[7] 2 vols., Tübingen, 1902—1923.

[8] Cf. among his publications particularly *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium,* Bonn, 1921 and *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen,* 3. ed., Leipzig, 1927.

East of a proto-Gnostic religion of salvation, at the heart of which stood the figure of the redeemed redeemer. This figure which is said in its diverse manifestations to bear the names Anthropos, Enosh, Manda d'Hayye, Messenger, Word, Baruch et al., and which the disciples of John and their Mandaic descendents are thought to have perceived in the person of the Baptist, Reitzenstein also found in the Synoptic Jesus as Son of Man. Reitzenstein himself has never extended the influence of the figure to the Fourth Gospel. It was R. Bultmann who introduced the redeemed redeemer into the comparative study of our document and thus opened a new phase of the Johannine inquiry.

The earliest indication of the new developments will be found in the article which opens the second volume of the Gunkel *Festschrift*[9] where Bultmann, accepting for the nonce Harris's interpretation of the Prologue endeavors to account for the transition from Sophia to Logos by the contention that the two were merged in the syncretistic soteriology of the Orient. Dropping the Wisdom idea and extending his inquiry into the christology of the Gospel as a whole Bultmann, in 1925, in a article published in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*,[10] declared the Johannine Christ to be almost the exact Christian counterpart of the proto-Gnostic redeemed redeemer. His claims in this connection were rivalled only by those of H. H. Schaeder of Hamburg who resolved the Prologue of John into a Mandaic hymn taken over in toto from Baptist circles, where it served to celebrate the appearance in John the Baptist of the redeemer Enosh, and transformed by its application to Christ and by the substitution of "a man" for "Enosh" into a bit of anti-Baptist polemic.[11]

The German scholars, while they have paid little attention to

---

[9] Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium, *Eucharisterion*, part 2, Göttingen, 1923, pp. 1—26.

[10] Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums, *ZNW*, XXIV, 1925, Heft 1—2, pp. 100—146.

[11] R. Reitzenstein u. H. H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran u. Griechenland*, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 306—341.

Reitzenstein's correlation of Anthropos and Synoptic Son of Man, have taken the coördination of Anthropos and Johannine Christ seriously indeed. This is indicated by the significance which has attached to the problem of the Mandeans in the German periodicals and by the fact that Walter Bauer, in the second edition of his excellent commentary on John in the Lietzmann series, has virtually given assent to Bultmann's conclusions and has quoted liberally from the Mandaic texts.

The antithesis existing to-day between German criticism and that of England and America will be eminently revealed to anyone who compares Bauer's publication with the cautious work of Archbishop Bernard and the suggestive commentary of Professor Macgregor on the identical subject.[12]

In their failure to swallow hook, line and sinker with the Mandaic bait, the English commentators have in our opinion showed excellent discretion, for the significance of the Mandaic sect, *as a sect*, has been greatly overestimated and its texts distinctly abused. It is possible and indeed quite probable that the Mandaic sect has its ultimate origin in Palestine and that in some form it dates back to the first centuries of Christian thought. But only a meagre and as yet not clearly defined element of the written tradition carries back that far. Belief in the divine origin of the soul, the practise of baptismal rites and the acceptance of certain of the antediluvians as revealers of the counsels of God, these seem to be the foci of the Palestinian form of Mandaic religious thought. The redeemed redeemer, who unquestionably existed in Manichean theology has found but a secondary reflexion in Mandaic texts, being visible only in some of the hymns of the left Ginza and the liturgies and in certain of the acquired traits of the antediluvian patriarchs.[13] Fundamentally Manda d'Hayye, the most important of the Mandean saviors we incline to regard not as a manifestation of this redeemed redeemer but as the liberating power of divine Wisdom in its hypostatic manifestation. To suppose, therefore, that statements concerning the Mandean prophet-saviors Enosh, Hibil and Manda d'Hayye, quoted indiscriminately, can illumine the origin of the Johannine Christology is as unwarranted as to maintain that the *puer phosphorus* of Ginza IX, 2 can supply to the redeemed redeemer the name μονογενής which he must have if he is to be connected with the Johannine Christ.[14] Whatever the origin of the Johannine christology may be, it is almost certainly not to be found in the redeemed redeemer in whom we see rather the end than the beginning of syncretistic Oriental soteriology.

---

[12] Macgregor, G. H. C., The Gospel of John, *Moffatt New Testament Commentary*, London, 1928.

[13] Cf. my *Anthropos and Son of Man*, New York, 1927, pp. 55—73.

While English and American scholars are thus in our humble opinion to be commended for their failure to accept the conclusions of Bultmann, Schaeder and Bauer with regard to the Mandean influence upon the Fourth Gospel, they should be urged to adopt an attitude other than that of aloofness from the general discussion. The Mandean episode of Johannine Criticism is a purely momentary phenomenon induced by the novity in translation of the Mandaic texts. Its fundamental errors are first the use of the Mandaic texts as a source rather than as a symbol, and second the use of the Mandaic texts by themselves alone. More than that, the Mandean discussions have obscured the great issue which Reitzenstein originally raised concerning the genesis of syncretistic religious belief. It is probable, we feel, that the properly Mandaic phase of the comparative study of the Fourth Gospel will come to close in the near future, and that a new phase will begin in which the fundamental principles of Reitzenstein will be applied along new lines. Not the redeemed redeemer alone but other figures and concepts, cosmogony, ritual usage and the psychology of mystical expression, all these and others will be analyzed as elements of the development of late Oriental religion, a development which in view of the interplay of its elements and of the nature of its trends will become the basis for determining the relation of Johannine belief and contemporary religious thought.

One indication of a change of outlook is already in evidence. This will be found in Odeberg's recent publication on the Fourth Gospel where the narrow limits of a comparison utilizing the Mandaic texts alone are being broken down, rabbinical exegesis being invoked to assist in explaining the Johannine conception of the Son of Man.[15] It is evident that Odeberg is working in the right direction and if in his book we feel the lack of convincing proof of his assertions, it is because we have not yet achieved a concrete representation of the historic milieu wherein the Johannine theology was born, a representation the very reality of which would make cogent for the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel the sequence of speculative thought often so admirably sketched. We shall need to know much more not only about rabbinical exegesis but also about Syrian syncretism, about patristic tradition where it reflects local and sectarian interests, and about Jewish influence in both syncretistic and Christian spheres before we can expect Odeberg's type of analysis to come to fruition.

---

[14] Cf. Bauer, W., Das Johannesevangelium, in *Lietzmann's Handbuch*, 2. ed. Tübingen, 1925.

Perhaps it would not be amiss to illustrate by an example the possibilities for Johannine exegesis latent in the broader study of later Oriental religious thought.

We are all familiar, no doubt, with the peculiar Johannine use of ζωή. As a gift, or a power, or a quality which persons acquire here and now through their contact with the transcendent Christ, who is and in whom is Life, it has come to be considered the Hellenistic substitute for the synoptic teaching on the Kingdom as the good in which man can share. But Greek it is not, not only because we must distinguish between the negative implications of ἀθανασία and the positive associations of ζωή but also and primarily because in philosophic terminology from Aristotle down ζωή indicates a state of being induced and characterized by motion rather than by some inherent quality. Nor can we call the Johannine use of ζωή Alexandrine, for Philo at this point follows the Greek philosophers, as Grill has shown,[16] the bulk of the Hermetic texts falling into line with him, tracts I and XIII, where, as most people admit, we are admittedly dealing with a non-Alexandrine tradition, forming the sole exceptions.

If the Hellenistic West shows no analogy, even in much of its

---

[15] Odeberg, Hugo, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala, 1929.

[16] *Untersuchungen*, vol. I, pp. 206—211.

Christian tradition, to the Johannine use of ζωή, the Hellenistic Orient does. The Mandean parallels are by this time well known, the peculiarity of the Mandean use of הייא being that in one phase of the development of Mandean theology the word became the central concept of a unified system of religious tought. This Mandean "Life theology" as a second stratum of Mandaic thought we venture to connect with the second home of the Mandeans in Adiabene.[17] It is important to note that virtually all of the individual peculiarities of the Mandean use of הייא reappear in the works of the Syriac Church Fathers, Aphraates, Ephraem and Narsai, as well as in the Syriac form of the Acts of Thomas, while some of them may be found also in the Odes of Solomon and Ignatius. The early Christian inscriptions of Syria delight in the use of ζωή, but the sentiment conveyed is different from that inherent in the *vivas* of the Latin tumuli of the West, while simultaneously explaining the Christian use of the phrase θάρσε ψυχὴ οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος, for a man may be mortal and yet have in him Life. The Syrian Gnostics and Syncretists complete the picture with regard to the Oriental use of ζωή. Bardesanes' Trinity is worth mentioning in this connection.

All this evidence taken together indicates that the religious and qualitative use of ζωή is particularly well represented in Hellenistic Syria and northern Mesopotamia. With that fact in our possession we are, however, one step removed from the interpretation of the origin of the Johannine mystical terminology.

The religious use of the concept Life has a history also in the Old Testament and its Apocrypha. This phase of its history has been traced with admirable clarity by Baudissin[18] and Robertson Smith.[19] The conclusion of these two great scholars seems to be that the religious use of חַי came to the Hebrews through the latter's contact with an old Semitic concept of deity that found classic expression in northern Palestine. And here, as a matter of fact, in the north

---

[17] Cf. my article, The Origin and Antiquity of the Mandeans, *JAOS*, vol. 49, 1929, pp. 202—204.

[18] Baudissin, W. W., *Adonis u. Esmun*, Leipzig, 1911.

[19] Smith, W. Robertson, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, 3. ed., by Stanley A. Cook, New York, 1927, pp. 555—557, *et al.*

Semitic inscriptions of even remotely pre-Christian centuries we find Life used not only nominally as an attribute of deity, but verbally as the equivalent of the Greek σώζειν.

Under normal conditions we should be inclined to connect the Johannine ζωή with the Old Testament and Apocryphal parallels, allowing here, as in the Prologue, for the influence of certain vague forces in explaining the advance of the later over the earlier usage. But when we remember that the Jewish and Old Testament usage is but a secondary offshoot of the north Palestinian, that the fundamental characteristics of the Johannine use are in line with what we find in Hellenistic Syria, and that this same Johannine use has no parallel at all in those Gospels that reveal most intimately the Christian tradition of the Jewish communities, it becomes apparent that not the Old Testament but Hellenistic Syria has in this particular determined the Johannine mystical terminology. This does not mean that the Fourth Gospel is Mandean, or Syncretistic or even Iranian in thought. It signifies merely that our document uses the religious coin current in the northern province generally, and that, like other precipitates of Syrian religious thought, it appeals to the mind of the community by stating its own proper prejudices in terms locally accepted as fundamental to all religious belief.

When the Evangelion da Mepharreshe, though it owns the word ܦܘܪܩܢܐ with which it renders ἀπολύτρωσις, invariably translates the New Testament σωτήρ and σωτηρία by the use of ܡܚܝܢܐ and ܚܝܐ, it follows not the Johannine but the same local Syrian tradition.[20]

Perhaps the example of ζωή will illustrate the vistas that reveal themselves in following what is properly Reitzenstein's method of comparative study, a method in which the document under discussion is studied not in the light of any one parallel, but in the light of the development of Hellenistic religious thought generally. It would be rash to say that even this type of study will solve all our problems. But some contributions, particularly to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, are within the realm of possibility.

---

[20] The writer reserves for himself the privilege of treating in greater detail the origin, development and significance of the Hellenistic use of the concept Life.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.
THE BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

G. H. C. MACGREGOR
HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A territory so vast and so diversified, yet so often explored, that one despairs even of taking a short cut through it without intersecting at many points the well-trodden track. If in sketching once again the well-known picture I seem to trace the lights and shades with lines unduly hard and clear-cut, it is because, I take it, the aim of a paper such as this is first and foremost to stimulate discussion—an end best achieved if controversial positions be stated with a provocative positiveness which, be it confessed, does not always reflect the writer's own mood.

The Fourth Gospel is the ripest fruit of the ripest experience and thinking of early Christianity. Its thought is intimately interwoven with the interests, needs, problems of one definite age, and that one of the most varied and complicated periods in the history of the ancient world—that is our foreground—,while it attempts to fuse together elements drawn from a past itself so many-coloured as to be extremely difficult to harmonize—that is the background. With recent work on the Gospel in view, in particular Dr. Bernard's commentary, one confesses the feeling that the need of the moment is not so much for an analysis of that background as for a renewed insistence on the fact that the Gospel cannot be rightly evaluated if treated as a flat photographic study, but only if viewed before an experiential background of infinite depth and diversity.

The reactionary trend of some recent writing provokes a somewhat emphatic restatement of the main issue. The mere question of authorship still looms much too large. If the value of the gospel (be it historical or religious) be great in itself, then it matters little who wrote it: if small, we can make it no greater by postulating its apostolic origin. But on this main issue a clear decision is demanded—else all progressive study of the New Testament becomes precarious: Is the Gospel history based on authentic tradition, or theology built on a spiritual experience? If it is meant to be history, then it is either of very little value, or it becomes the standard for testing all other accounts; its nature is such that it is futile to imagine that, save in a most general sense, it can be made to supplement the Synoptic material; its outline and coloration must become the basis of all our historical study of Jesus.

If on the other hand the Gospel was meant from the first to be a religious and theological interpretation of the Person of Christ in the light of two generations of Christian experience, then again it is vain to imagine that it can be studied except as such, and therefore always with the background full in view; and the attempt to use any considerable parts of it to correct our historical perspective will not only do a profound injustice to the Gospel itself, but will result in obscuring the picture derived from Mark. Insistence on the value of the Fourth Gospel for immediate history inevitably leads (and this appears conspicuously in Dr. Bernard's book) to a depreciation of the Synoptics, and ultimately to a far-reaching distrust of all our sources. Frankly, we are confronted with an "*entweder... oder*"; that is the issue and it cannot be evaded.

In spite of much that is invaluable in his commentary Dr. Bernard has done scholarship the disservice that once again he has obscured this issue. It is true that he abandons the theory of Apostolic authorship—a surrender denounced by those who otherwise praise the book most loudly as "a weak concession to the modernist spirit", but in truth one that marks the victory of criticism over tradition in one of its most strongly entrenched positions. But in effect the concession is largely illusory: the whole exposition is obsessed by the shadow of the Apostolic eye-witness, who is still to such an extent made responsible for the substance both of narrative and discourse that the strict historicity of the record is hardly affected. The whole picture is projected as a near-focussed photographic foreground and the background is blurred out. All this has been loudly hailed as "the coming back of the Fourth Gospel to its own." But the net result of this insistence on fitting by hook or crook as much as possible even of the discourses into the historical conditions of Jesus' own day is to obscure what is in fact the Gospel's "own" imperishable contribution, and to hinder our appreciation of it as an expression of a mature theology in which history and experience have been fused into a higher and eternal synthesis.

There are two occasions in the Gospel when we are told that "the disciples remembered"—a word or an incident misunderstood at the moment became clear in the light of experience (2 17, 22; 12 16). A hint here of the Gospel's purpose, to set in a clearer light, before the background of two generations of Christian experience, the essential truth of the Christian message. It is the expression moreover of the religious experience not only of one man in his old age—though we may still look to Browning's "Death in the Desert" as the best exposition of the experience of the evangelist himself: it is the expression of three-quarters of a century's experience of Christ on the part of a whole Church. Over that long gulf the Church "remembered"; but, as Dr. Denney I think once put it, His disciples never "remembered Jesus"; they always saw Him as He was, transfigured through their wonderful experience. The Gospel shows us Jesus as His Church had experienced Him.

That this interpretative element is the dominant one appears from the following characteristics:

(1) The Evangelist's strange lack of sustained interest in history for its own sake. His characters (Nicodemus, the Greeks who "would see Jesus") as the climax approaches "evaporate from the stage". A dramatic scene, at the moment of greatest tension, drifts over into doctrinal meditation. However lifelike the minor touches of detail, in its larger outlook the Gospel is historically unconvincing. There is no sense of development; as for one whose eyes are fixed upon the far-distant background the perspective be-

comes foreshortened, time becomes telescoped and today's experience is thrown back into yesterday. It is only the abiding, spiritual, eternal in history which has significance for John, history written "*sub specie aeternitatis*", under the impulse of a living religious experience. The Gospel is still our best teacher of how to read the eternal import of the Synoptics. It has taught us to find the eternal in history, but the history in which we are to find it is not the Johannine but the Synoptic. As for John's own idealized history, as Dr. B. W. Bacon has finely said, it is "genuine and true because reflecting the heart's faith of a great Church in a great age.[1]"

(2) Hence again the Evangelist's fondness for the allegorical method. This too must be positively asserted in face of Dr. Bernard's drastic denials. Protest, as we rightly may, against the weird and wonderful meanings woven out of the fantastic imagination of commentators ancient and modern, insist, as we rightly do, that the suitability of an incident for allegorical treatment does not prove that it has no historical basis, it still remains true—and might be so even if John the Son of Zebedee were the author—that the evangelist, looking back upon the past in the light of his enhanced knowledge of Christ and his ripe experience of his fellow men, is more concerned with the inner meaning of events than with events themselves, and realises that more important than the fact is the spiritual idea of which the fact is the mere adumbration. That surely is precisely what is meant when in Alexandrian language we speak of the book as "a spiritual gospel," "spiritual" in the Philonic sense—the figurative and allegorical as contrasted with the "bodily" or literal meaning of Scripture, in this instance the soul of Jesus' life-story rather than its body. And a soul is born only out of the travail of experience. Dr. Bernard's insistence on a bald literalism drives him to several most unhappy attempts at rationalizing in his efforts, as one reviewer puts it[2], to "provide first aid to the incredulous," while it constantly obscures our understanding of a writer who, on any showing, knew well the value of symbolism as a medium for the crystallization into the truths of eternity of the

---

[1] "The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate", New Haven, 1918, p. 14.

[2] C. H. Dodd in *The Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1929.

soul's experience in time. Von Hugel's great dictum, which Dr. Bernard vigorously assails, still remains true: "The Fourth Gospel is the noblest instance of this kind of literature, of which the truth depends, not on the factual accuracy of the symbolizing experiences, but on the truth of the ideas and experiences thus symbolized.[3]"

(3) But it is above all to the discourse material that one turns for proof and illustration that the Gospel is the deposit of a rich and long Christian experience and can be interpreted only in the light of it. We are listening not so much to the historic Jesus as to the Living Christ speaking through a great disciple who "remembered and understood." Nay rather it is out of a corporate experience that He speaks, for Johannine piety has its springs not, like that of Paul, in the dramatic experience of an individual life, but in the collective experience of that community in whose name, though the actual word "church" never occurs, the first person plural is once and again used. Is this the secret of the Gospel's unrivalled capacity to crystallize Christian doctrine into brief, unforgettable, universal, almost proverbial summaries of the truth that is in Christ? In any case the discourses bear a much more living relationship to the circumstances and conditions of the age which produced the Gospel than to the actual discussions of our Lord's own day; they represent not so much the historical teaching of Jesus as the writer's attempt in the name of Jesus to define some later Christian experience or some universal Christian truth. Examples readily suggest themselves:

(a) There is the polemical element: the Christ of John, confronting not the Scribes and Pharisees but a whole hostile Jewish nation, undoubtedly reflects the consciousness not of the historic Jesus but of the Church at the close of the first century; and not only the identity of the opposition but the controversy itself has been transformed. The objections which Jesus answers centre on his unity with God, his preexistence, the partaking of his flesh and blood, the apparent failure of his mission—precisely the points urged by Jews against the rival religion and conspicuous in the controversial literature of the second century. It is clear that we have to do not with the conflict between Jesus and his enemies but with the hostility of Judaism to Apostolic Christianity. The Evangelist has read back into his record the Church's experience of the conflicts and controversies of his own age.

---

[3] *Ency. Britt.* in his article on the Gospel.

(b) The same is true of passage after passage where the Master is shown preoccupied not with external controversy but with the inner life and growth of "His own." "I sent you to reap that whereon ye have not laboured: others have laboured, and ye are entered into their labour" (4 38)—puzzling words for the commentator assuming them to be applicable to the immediate situation at the Well of Sychar, but how pregnant of meaning if the Evangelist be thinking of all those first Christian missionaries into whose labours he and his fellow-workers at the beginning of the 2nd century have entered. "All who came before me have been thieves and robbers" (10 8)—difficult if we suppose Jesus to be impugning the sincerity of e. g. Moses and the prophets, but full of light if the Evangelist has in mind the succession of false teachers, be they Jewish reactionaries or Gnostic heretics, who forestalling the real Gospel, like some impostor presenting himself at the fold in the early hour before the true shepherd arrives, have sought to seduce men from the true community of Christ. "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven . . . Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye have not life in yourselves" (6 51—53). Can it still be denied that the whole of Chapter 6 may not only be *applied* to the Eucharist, but must be *interpreted* with reference to it? and that, if so the discourse becomes intelligible, not as a verbatim report of Jesus' own words, but only in the light of the Evangelist's experience of the sacramental controversies and perplexities of his own day? "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing" (6 63). How much more living the words become once we realise that we have here not only one of those marvellous crystallizations of the mind and spirit of Jesus, but also the watchword of a practical teacher who, out of his experience of various types of contemporary critic, is seeking to hold the balance between a realism, congenial to his Gentile environment, and his own more spiritual conception of sacramental grace. It is only in the reaction of John's thought to the exigencies of a controversial experience which he and his Church are weathering that we can find the clue to the unravelling of the various strands in his apparently inconsistent sacramental teaching.

(c) But the widest view into this background of experience is opened up in the teaching on the Spirit. "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (7 39) . . . "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go I will send him unto you" (16 7). Here is the Evangelist bearing witness out of the Church's experience that the glorified Christ as spirit with spirit holds with his people everywhere a communion even more real than once he did with his friends in the days of his flesh. "He when he is come will convict the world in respect of judgment . . . because the prince of this world has been judged" (16 8–11). There the triumphant testimony that the work of the Spirit manifested in the Church's experience has demonstrated that by Christ's death evil is utterly discredited and the Devil fighting a losing battle. "When the Comforter is come, even the Spirit of truth, he shall bear witness of me" (15 26). Here again the consciousness that the inward meaning of Jesus' life and words can only be defined and interpreted through the spiritual experience of his followers—a profound truth on which the Evangelist's own spiritual Gospel is the best of all commentaries. "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" (16 13). There the charter—again won by two generations of Christian experience—of the Church's right to look for an ever progressively developing revelation of truth, an eternal protest against all fixity of dogma. The Spirit in this Gospel is just that principle of inner development whereby old truth breaks forth into new life, shattering it may be the outward husk of traditional belief to reveal more perfectly its essential content—a principle ever finding its expression in the God-guided experience of the Christian community.

It remains as briefly as possible to survey the main features of this background of experience. We may look down three vistas:

(1) The writer has experienced the transition from an age of

immediate contact with the Master and his personal followers to an age when the last of such human links was about to be broken. No longer is the Church's work and message conditioned by the expectation of the near return of the Lord to judgment. Eschatological hope has been transmuted into mystical experience, and the Parousia is no longer placed on the clouds of heaven but in the hearts of believers. And yet the Gospel still marks the stages through which the Church has passed. Here and there we meet passages which reveal as it were the outcropping of a lower stratum of doctrine, concessions to an earlier point of view, back-waters of more primitive teaching which stand in isolation though the main current of the writer's thought has flowed beyond. One can but instance the persistence in a few isolated verses of primitive conceptions of Resurrection, Judgment, the Ascension, the Parousia (cf. 1 29, 14 3, 20 17, 5 28—9, 6 39). Milestones these on the way of the Church's progressive search for truth.

(2) The writer has lived through an age, for the gospel, of transition from an origin fundamentally Jewish into a culture predominantly Hellenistic. His great achievement was to transplant the gospel into a new soil before its roots had time to wither. But here and there the roots still remain above ground. However true it be that John's creative deed was to transmute Jewish ideas into their Greek equivalent and thus make Christianity for the first time express itself as a Hellenistic religion, it cannot be gainsaid that beneath his Gospel there still runs a deep undercurrent of Hebrew ways of thought and speech. The whole background of Old Testament revelation is accepted and taken for granted, and perhaps the most valuable result of recent work on the Gospel has been to show that elements which in the past have too readily been ascribed to pagan influence have antecedents more direct in the Old Testament itself. One can but open in passing this vista into the author's background.

(3) Finally the Gospel's background reflects a transition from a knowledge of Christ based on the first-hand contact of his intimates to a knowledge which is essentially the product of religious experience. It is as we look down this vista that we see stan-

ding behind the writer the towering figure of St. Paul. Though doubtless some of the Apostle's greatest conceptions—his idea of faith, sin, the significance of Christ's death,—are grasped imperfectly by the Evangelist, yet John's whole outlook on the Christian revelation is coloured by Paul's, for it was he, not John, who first conceived as the real object of faith, not the human Jesus of history, but the glorified Christ of experience. Deissmann in his great book on Paul speaks of "the Johannine writings in which there pulses the warm life-blood of Paul's devotion to Christ. John is the oldest and the greatest interpreter of Paul.[4]" And it is just in his insistence on the oneness of the historical Jesus with the Christ of the Church's experience that John most truly shows himself Paul's disciple. For Paul—again I quote Deissmann—"communion with the Spirit-Christ transforms all that we call the 'historical' Christ, all that found its climax in Golgotha, all that had been entrusted to the Apostle as tradition about Jesus, into a present reality,[5]" while "the greatest monument of the most genuine understanding of Paul's mysticism is the Gospel and Epistles of John; their Logos-Christ is the Spirit-Christ, once more made incarnate for the congregation of the saints in a time of fierce conflict by the Evangelist who was inspired in equal degree by the earthly Jesus, by Paul and by the Spirit-Christ.[6]"

Herein indeed is John's greatest achievement, and with this thought I conclude. Once Christianity was separated from its historical origins it became prone—in Dr. E. F. Scott's memorable phrase—"either to evaporate as a philosophy or to petrify as a mechanical tradition;" and it is John's supreme service that by his double emphasis alike on the fact of the Incarnation and on the experience of the Spirit he averted both perils. Accordingly we may fittingly apply to John what Deissmann yet again says of Paul: "The mere spiritual Christ, so easily liable to become attenuated to a Christ idea, would have created neither a religion of the people nor a religion of the peoples, but would have remained a rapidly worn out thesis for discussion among a narrow circle of Christologists. The mere historical Jesus . . . would have made Christianity retrospective, bound by the Law like Judaism, rigid like Islam. The Pauline (and, we add, Johannine) Christ-intimacy with its decisive confession to the Christ present and coming, who is the crucified Jesus, made both past and future present.[7]" "Both past and future present"—that is the measure both of the background of Christian experience and of the far horizons of Christian hope from which the Gospel draws its inspiration.

---

[4] Deissmann, A., *Paul*, 2. ed., London, 1926, p. 7.

[5] *ibid.*, p. 143.

[6] *ibid.*, p. 155.

---

[7] *ibid.*, p. 257.

SENNACHERIB AND THE WALLED CITIES OF JUDAH

RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY
YALE UNIVERSITY

SENNACHERIB'S program of subjugation in Judah in 701 B.C. is of special interest to the student of events recorded in the Old Testament. In this expedition the Assyrian king endeavored to do for Judah what Shalmaneser V and Sargon II had done for Samaria. The armies of Nineveh always sought to capture the royal city of any country in which they were making a campaign. Sennacherib was not able to attain this end in Judah, for Jerusalem with its strong defences was successful in withstanding his hostile advance. The remaining cities of Judah, although strongly fortified, were less fortunate. One by one they succumbed to the onslaught of Assyria's might.

The assertions made in the foregoing paragraph are based upon Hebrew and cuneiform documents. The Hebrew version of Sennacherib's success is recorded in 2 Kings 18 13 and in Isaiah 36 1. These two passages deviate very little from one another and hence may be regarded as representing a single source of information. It will be sufficient, therefore, to refer to the former reference in the discussion which follows. Four cuneiform attestations of Sennacherib's victory in the land of Judah have been recovered and deciphered. Two brief allusions and two more extensive references to this event, supplied by the contemporary scribe's stylus, are thus at our disposal. In addition, archaeological investigation has made a definite contribution to our understanding of the difficulties which Sennacherib had to overcome. Excavations at Lachish, Tell en-Nasbeh, and Tell Beit Mirsim have uncovered thick city walls. In the following paragraphs the literary and archaeological data capable of throwing light upon Sennacherib's devastating campaign in Judah will be considered.

The source of information concerning Sennacherib's vanquishment of Judah which has been longest at our disposal is the Old Testament. Sparsity of detail characterizes what is told in Hebrew about this momentous catastrophe. It is evident that the recorder wished to express his interpretation of the event in the fewest possible words. However, his unembellished statement is a notable example of the Hebrew historian's ability to include all essential facts in an assertion characterized by extreme brevity. Nothing could be more effective than the following words in 2 Kings 18 13: "And in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and seized them." A proper chronological and dynastic background gives vividness to the acts ascribed to Sennacherib. The march of his army from Assyria to Palestine, his investment of "all the fortified cities of Judah," and his reduction of them to submission may be visualized as one reads the account. There is contextual intimation that Jerusalem was not compelled to yield to martial force.[1] Hezekiah sent an embassy to Lachish and treated with the victorious sovereign. A heavy tribute was the sign of homage demanded by Sennacherib.[2]

Several features of the Hebrew version of Sennacherib's triumph over Judah should be noted. In the first place, the narrator portrays the strength of the cities which were seized and hence suggests the difficulties of the campaign. The term used to designate the character of the centers of population in Judah which were captured by Sennacherib is the feminine plural of the passive participle בצור, the primary meaning of which is "inaccessible." It is generally understood that this signifies that the cities were fortified by means of strong and lofty walls. Furthermore, the text declares that the whole of Judah, כל ערי יהודה הבצרות, felt the impress of Sennacherib's military offensive. Real conquest is indicated by the use of the verb תפש, "lay hold of," "seize," "capture." These meanings bring to mind the Assyrian verb *kašâdu*, "reach," "overtake," "capture," which is commonly employed under similar circumstances in cuneiform inscriptions.

---

[1] 2 Kings 18 14. In suceeding notes the following abbreviations will be used. *ARAB* = Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*; *AS* = Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib.* It has been thought best to refer to translations of cuneiform passages rather than to cuneiform texts. At the same time the writer has taken the liberty to vary the translations in certain instances.

[2] Three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold.

The terseness of the Hebrew account of Sennacherib's conquest of Judah is matched by two laconic statements in cuneiform. These passages have not been granted due prominence on account of the two more detailed Assyrian statements concerning Judah's overthrow. There is a distinct gain, however, in emphasizing them, inasmuch as their very conciseness may be regarded as contributing to their value. The scribe attributes the following curt words to Sennacherib: "I ruined the wide province of the land of Judah. The powerful ruler Hezekiah, its king, I caused to submit." [3] The variant reads thus: "I ruined the wide province of the land of Judah. On Hezekiah, its king, I imposed my yoke."[4] It is to be noted that both assertions indicate that Sennacherib's devastating power ranged through the length and breadth of Judah. Jerusalem is not mentioned, but there can be no doubt that the utter submission of Hezekiah is affirmed. Hence the data preserved in Hebrew literature and the facts mentioned in these brief cuneiform passages are in complete harmony.

A more extensive cuneiform record of events in Judah in 701 B.C. is found in what is known as the bull inscription from the palace of Nineveh. The pertinent part of this text may be translated as follows: "Because of the fact that Hezekiah, the Judaean, had not submitted to my yoke, forty-six of his strong, walled cities and the cities of their environs, which had no number, I besieged, captured, plundered, and counted as booty. As for him, like a bird of a basket[5] in the midst of Jerusalem, his royal city, I imprisoned him. Bulwarks I threw up against him."[6] This passage, true to Assyrian custom, places the responsibility upon Hezekiah for the fate which overtook the fortified communities of Judah. There is a statement as to the number of large cities which had to yield, but the small settlements around them were not thought worthy of exact counting. The different stages which followed one another in the reduction of a city are clearly and progressively indicated, viz., preparatory beleaguering, storming with resultant seizure, rapacious looting, and organized removal of booty. Drastic operations against Jerusalem are mentioned, but no claim is made that the royal city was captured. However, the cuneiform record goes on to state that a heavy tribute was exacted of Hezekiah.[7]

---

[3] *AS* p. 77, lines 20, 21.

[4] *AS* p. 86, line 15.

The most striking statement concerning Sennacherib's military operations in Judah remains to be considered. This possesses the framework of the passage which has just been discussed, but the account is enlarged by the addition of several descriptive passages. In the following translation the entirely new assertions are in italics: "And as for Hezekiah, the Judaean, who did not submit to my yoke, forty-six of his strong, walled cities, and the *small* cities of their environs, which had no number, I besieged (and) captured *by the use of earthen ramps*[8] *and the onslaught of siege engines,* (*by*) *the*

---

[5] The Assyrian is *kîma iṣṣur quppi*, which may be translated freely, "like a bird in a cage." See *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* V, p. 24f.

[6] *AS* p. 70, lines 27—29. This cuneiform text adds that Sennacherib gave the plundered cities of Judah to the kings of Ashdod, Ashkelon, Ekron, and Gaza.

[7] *AS* p. 70, lines 31, 32. Luckenbill's translation is as follows: "With thirty talents of gold, eight hundred talents of silver, and all kinds of treasure from his palace, he sent his daughters, his palace women, his male and female singers to Nineveh, and he dispatched his messenger to pay the tribute."

[8] See *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* XXII, columns 112—114, for a discussion by Meissner of the Assyrian word *arammu*, which was used to denote a heaping up of earth in connection with attack upon a city.

attack of storming on foot, (by) tunneling, cutting, and breaches. Two hundred thousand and one hundred and fifty people, small and great, male and female, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep, which were without number, I caused to go forth from their midst and counted as booty. As for him, like a bird of a basket I imprisoned him in the midst of Jerusalem, his royal city. Bulwarks I threw up against him. *I turned back to his woe the one who came forth from his city gate.*"[9] The strenuous manner of attack, the character of the spoil, and the harsh attitude towards the inhabitants of besieged Jerusalem are revealed by the added portions. The consequent recognition of Sennacherib's authority by Hezekiah and the payment by him of various kinds of tribute[10] are also referred to in this longer inscription without a statement that Jerusalem was captured during the progress of hostilities.

The foregoing comparison of the cuneiform passages which chronicle Sennacherib's conquest of Judah shows that they are in accord with one another. Explanatory enlargements of the two terse accounts are found in the two lengthy records. In this connection the fact that Sennacherib may have made two campaigns in Palestine should be kept in mind. Full elucidation of the theories arising from this possibility is not necessary in this article.[11] If, as is indicated strongly by certain facts, Sennacherib did engage in a second military expedition against Judah, it was the one which ended disastrously according to 2 Kings 19 35. Knowledge of the practice of Assyrian kings under such circumstances prepares us for the non-existence of a cuneiform description of this debacle. Such a defeat was naturally ignored by ancient Assyrian scribes who were expected to write only of that which would exalt the glory of their monarch. It is evident that each of the four cuneiform texts which have been discussed describes the events referred to in 2 Kings 18 13 and the following verses.

---

[9] *AS* p. 32f, lines 18—30. In the passage which follows only the kings of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza are mentioned as recipients of the plundered cities of Judah.

[10] There is a more detailed inventory of Hezekiah's tribute. See *AS* p. 34, lines 41—49. The thirty talents of gold and the eight hundred talents of silver are mentioned. Then there is an enumeration of precious stones, couches and chairs of ivory, elephant hide, ivory, and rare kinds of wood. The daughters of Hezekiah, his harem, and musicians are included in the list.

[11] See Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, 5th edition, pp. 434—437, for a summary of the theories. There is also a discussion of the hypothesis of two campaigns in *AS* p. 12f, where Luckenbill indicates that the view that there was only one campaign may be defended.

Three general conclusions may be drawn from the cuneiform inscriptions which furnish data concerning Sennacherib's activities in Judah in 701 B. C.

(1) *The subjugation of Judah was widespread.* The "wide province of the land of Judah" was ruined. Forty-six of its strongest cities and an uncounted number of smaller and less fortified towns, many of which were probably suburban villages,[12] were "besieged, captured, plundered, and counted as booty." The spoil which is enumerated in the longest text represents the usual pillage which came to the victor in such a conflict in ancient times. Although there is no indication that Jerusalem yielded in the storm of battle, Hezekiah was forced to discontinue resistance by the condition which prevailed throughout his land.[13] A direct tribute of gold and silver was imposed upon him and he sent many other presents to Nineveh.[14] The picture presented in 2 Kings 18 13 is essentially the same.

---

[12] Professor W. F. Badè reports as follows in *Tell en-Nasbeh in 1929*, p. 5: "One of the interesting results brought to light by the progress of this season's excavations is the fact that the ancient city extended considerably beyond the area included within the walls. There were what one might call suburbs which covered the comparatively broad, level terraces on the eastern and southern flanks of the Tell. The existence of an Iron Age suburb on the southern slope had been established during the excavations of previous years." It is evident that this corroborates the situation portrayed by the cuneiform words *âlâni ṣiḫrûti ša limêtišunu*, "the small cities of their environs." See *AS* p. 32, line 20, and p. 70, line 28.

[13] A contributing factor was the desertion of Hezekiah's Arabian allies and his own picked troops. See *AS* p. 33f, lines 39—41, and p. 70, line 31.

[14] See notes 7 and 10. The amounts of silver and gold designated by the cuneiform records do not tally exactly with the amounts specified in the Hebrew record (see note 2), but there is complete agreement as to the amount of gold, i. e., thirty talents. This correspondence is sufficient to establish some connection between the records.

One must conclude, therefore, that the Hebrew record sprang from acquaintance with the real course of events.

(2) *The destruction of cities was partial.* The devastation of the land seems to have been superficial rather than thoroughgoing. Phraseology usually employed in cuneiform inscriptions to denote complete destruction is not found in the texts referring to the capture of the cities of Judah. They were not "destroyed, torn down, and turned to mounds," neither were their walls "leveled to the ground." The words expressing these processes are not used in a single one of the four Assyrian versions of what Sennacherib accomplished in Judah. One may infer from this that the cities of Judah were not left in a condition of absolute ruin. Their walls were enormously thick, and it would have required an immense amount of time and energy to raze them completely. It is apparent that this part of the task of rendering the people defenceless was not performed. Recovery on the part of Judah was probably rapid. Hence a second fateful expedition directed by Sennacherib against Judah with Jerusalem as the main objective is all the more likely to have occurred.

(3) *The mode of warfare was difficult.* The longest cuneiform text dealing with aggression on the part of Sennacherib in Judah employs striking language with reference to the means by which cities were brought to submission. This passage, when analyzed with care, informs us that Sennacherib used three methods in attacking the cities of Judah. Priority of mention is given to earthen ramps[15] and siege engines. It is known that heaps of earth were erected against walls so that siege engines, of which there are representations on Assyrian bas-reliefs,[16] might be taken up inclined planes.

---

[15] Cf. note 8.

[16] See Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* I, pp. 108—110. Such machines were used in Sennacherib's attack upon Lachish. Cf. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum alten Testamente*, Zweiter Band, pp. 138, 139, Abb. 271, 272. Lachish was a city in Judah and hence it was one of the *46 âlâni-šu dan-nu-ti bît-dûrâni*, "forty-six of his (Hezekiah's) strong, walled cities," mentioned as having been captured in the extended accounts of Sennacherib's campaign in Judah. See references in notes 6 and 9. The bas-relief representing Sennacherib at Lachish bears the following brief inscrip-

Secondary mention is given to storming on foot. In this phase of the battle the rank and file of Assyrian soldiery, skilled in the use of sword, javelin, and bow, contributed their share to the terror of the combat. In the third place there is mention of tunneling, cutting, and breach-making. Such operations must have been performed by men with shovels, picks, axes, and grappling hooks. With these three modes of attack in full swing one can imagine the intense energy and feverish tumult which brought about the subjugation of mighty walled cities in the land of Judah. Many cities in various lands were conquered by Sennacherib during the course of his eight campaigns. Some submitted without a struggle at the approach of the Assyrian army. Others, like those in Judah, resisted and were subjected to all the arts of Assyrian warfare. The remarkable fact is that the attacking methods of Sennacherib were thought worthy of detailed description only in connection with the seizure of the cities of Judah and the capture of Babylon (*AS*, p. 83, line 45). For some reason the cuneiform scribe was impelled to enlarge upon the difficulties which attended their conquest. We may be sure, therefore, that the magnitude of the task and the greatness of the achievement are amply and truly reflected.

Greater appreciation of the force of the cuneiform reference to the methods used by Sennacherib in subduing the cities of Judah may be gained by comparing it with similar passages in other Assyrian inscriptions. There is a passage in one of the inscriptions of Ashur-nâṣir-pal II of the first half of the ninth century B. C. which contains most suggestive phraseology. The Assyrian king reports thus through his scribe: "The city was exceeding strong. It was surrounded by two walls and its citadel was built like a mountain peak. Trusting in the supreme might of Ashur, my lord, with the masses of my hosts and with my furious onslaught I battled with

---

tion: "Sennacherib, king of totality, king of Assyria, sat upon a standing chair and the spoil of Lachish passed before him." See *AS* p. 156, inscription XXV. In the Hebrew record, 2 Kings 18 14, occurs the statement that Hezekiah, king of Judah, communicated with Sennacherib at Lachish, which is another indication of the historical accuracy of this portion of Old Testament tradition.

them. For two days, from before sunrise, I thundered like Adad, the god of storm, and I rained down flame upon them. With courage and might my warriors flew (literally, hastened) against them like the Zu bird."[17] In addition Ashur-nâṣir-pal II boasts of having captured cities protected by as many as three and four walls.[18] That the ordinary implements of human toil were employed for the purpose of mural destruction is indicated by a passage from one of the records of Sargon II of the latter part of the eighth century B. C. The statement is as follows: "The mighty wall, which was made of stone from the lofty mountain, with iron axes and iron hoes I crushed like an earthen vessel and leveled it to the ground."[19] Assyrian soldiers were not limited to such primitive weapons, for bas-reliefs picture the part played by mechanisms of war in the shattering of turreted walls.[20] Two passages in inscriptions of Ashur-nâṣir-pal II indicate that the digging of mines or tunnels was supplemented by the activity of wallcrushers and siege engines.[21] The inscriptions of Tiglathpileser III of the eighth century B. C. show that he used earthworks in conjunction with siege engines.[22] Esarhaddon in the first half of the seventh century B. C. rendered Memphis in Egypt helpless in half a day by a combination of processes which may be described as tunneling, cutting, and tearing.[23] In the record of Nabopolassar's campaigns in territory belonging to the Assyrians there is mention of the use of a siege engine in connection with the assault upon the city of Anatu (modern Anah) in the middle Euphrates region.[24]

Unless some pertinent statement has escaped notice all known Assyrian references to machines used in warfare, including the remarkable passage in the account of Sennacherib's third campaign, have now been enumerated. These extremely few allusions to siege engines, etc., in Assyrian military texts should not blind us to the probability that such contrivances were used quite commonly by Assyrian warriors in the reduction of strong centers of population to submission. Whenever an Assyrian inscription reports a king as saying concerning a victory, "I destroyed the city, I devastated it, I burned it with fire" or "I turned it into mounds and ruins," and even in case of more moderate phraseology, it is likely that the achievement which is portrayed was the result of energetic assault by means of the most effective devices known at the time. The Assyrian scribe was not called upon to go into detail with regard to all the military successes of his sovereign. One may conclude, therefore, that there must have been something unusual in the conflict whose record in cuneiform was embellished by references to the extreme efforts which had to be put forth in order to subdue the enemy. In the whole range of discovered Assyrian inscriptions the passage concerning the strenuous endeavors necessary for the capture of the fortified cities of Judah is unique in its completeness. As has been indicated, there are other references to the use of war machines and undermining operations, but the Sennacherib passage is the most striking and impressive. Hence we are driven to the conclusion that the Palestinian cities conquered by Sennacherib were protected by unusually strong walls.

---

[17] *ARAB* I, p. 179f, section 499.

[18] *ARAB* I, p. 147, section 445; p. 155, section 461.

[19] *ARAB* II, p. 87, section 161.

[20] See Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, Fig. 45, opposite p. 84. *Ibid.*, Fig. 104, opposite p. 244, shows an attacking engine on a specially constructed ramp similar to those used in the siege of Lachish. Cf. note 16.

[21] *ARAB* I, p. 163, section 474; p. 168, section 480.

[22] *ARAB* I, p. 284, sections 789, 790. Cf. Lindl, *Cyrus*, p. 73.

[23] *ARAB* II, p. 227, section 580.

[24] *ARAB* II, p. 419, section 1176.

Assyrian historical inscriptions are replete with accounts of arduous campaigns. There may be a modern tendency to regard such passages as somewhat boastful and distorted. If the taint of exaggeration can be removed from any particular narrative, a corrective influence is introduced. Archaeological discoveries in Palestine furnish testimony which cannot be ignored in estimating the accuracy of both the cuneiform and the Hebrew assertions concerning the strongly fortified condition of Judaean cities. Professor Flinders Petrie at Lachish, Professor W. F. Badè at Tell en-Nasbeh, and President M. G. Kyle and Professor W. F. Albright at Tell Beit Mirsim have uncovered strong walls. Professor Petrie's report has not made known the details concerning the city wall unearthed by him at the ruins of Lachish.[25] It will be sufficient to quote a few statements from Professor Badè's report with reference to the mural construction which he discovered at Tell en-Nasbeh, a mound which he regards as the remains of Mizpah of Benjamin. "A section cut into it revealed Iron Age pottery in the clay between the stones, and those who, like myself, are inclined to identify the site with the ancient Mizpah of Benjamin will have no difficulty in finding here a corroboration of the passage in 1 Kings 15 22 which relates that Asa of Judah fortified the walls of Benjamin against the encroachments of the Northern Kingdom. The archaeological evidence shows that the Bronze Age wall, which one time made the city a formidable fortress, had then long been lying in ruins. Therefore the Hebrew writer does not speak of a rebuilding process. Nevertheless the Israelite masons built upon earlier foundations, and as the result of their work the west-side wall attains the extraordinary thickness of twenty-six feet."[26] "So far as the writer is aware, this is the thickest and strongest wall which has yet been unearthed in Palestine. It so captivated our imaginations last season that we spent much time and labor in freeing the whole southern outside face to bedrock, in order to be able to study its structure."[27] "On account of the great width of the wall, the city's defenders doubtless could be moved along the top to meet attack from the outside."[28] This revelation of conditions at one of Judah's "fortified cities" is most illuminating. With regard to the Israelite wall found at Tell Beit Mirsim, which is identified as Kirjath-sepher, Professor Albright states that it "was only about two metres wide, on the average, while the glacis was formed by a series of rounded bastions built of much smaller stones than were used by the Canaanites."[29] A stone wall two metres thick was capable of offering considerable resistance to ancient methods of attack,[30] but there can be no doubt that walls such as have been found at Tell en-Nasbeh must have caused much more trouble to the soldiers of Sennacherib. With such archaeological data at hand the statement of the Assyrian scribe and the record in 2 Kings 18 13 acquire new meaning and validity.

---

[25] See Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, 5th edition, p. 140.

[26] Badè, *Excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh, 1926 and 1927*, Palestine Institute Publications, No. 1, p. 21.

[27] *Ibid., loc. cit.*

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[29] *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 23, p. 4. This number of the *Bulletin*, pp. 2—14, contains Professor Albright's preliminary report of the 1926 period of excavation at Tell Beit Mirsim. *Bulletin* 31, pp. 1—11, presents his description of the work at the same site in 1928. See

---

also *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Neue Folge, VI, H. 1, pp. 1—17, where the results of both campaigns are summarized by him. For President Kyle's reports see *Bibliotheca Sacra* LXXXIII, pp. 378—402; LXXXV, pp. 254—259, 381—408.

[30] See Kyle in *Bibliotheca Sacra* LXXXV, p. 258, for the view that Kirjath-sepher was "essentially a fortress, located strategically, walled most formidably." *Ibid.*, LXXXIII, p. 394, contains the following statement concerning the wall which was found around the rim of the mound: "The lower half is of old Canaanite construction, the upper half rebuilt, ofttimes of Canaanite stones, by the Israelites. This part is of inferior workmanship and usually of smaller stones." Both President Kyle and Professor Albright in their reconstruction of the city's history make no mention of archaeological evidence that the mound suffered in 701 B. C., and hence there seems to be intimation that it was not one of the forty-six cities of Judah attacked and seized by Sennacherib. However, Sennacherib states that he ruined "the wide province of the land of Judah," and the Hebrew record asserts that the Assyrian king seized "all the fortified cities of Judah." It may be that further investigation of the ruins will throw light upon this historical question. There is the possibility, of course, that the walls of Kirjath-sepher sustained only superficial demolition in 701 B. C.

THE TRANSLATION OF *GÊR* IN THE HEXATEUCH AND ITS BEARING ON THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

AS is well known, a word does not necessarily mean the same wherever it is found. In different contexts the same word may have decidedly different meanings, and in the course of time a word may change quite radically and in its later usage have a sense very different from what it had originally. This is a principle universally recognized, and yet in our translations of the Old Testament it is very frequently ignored, as, for instance, in the case of the word גֵּר.

In its root meaning גר, like the Arabic جَار, has reference to one who has come to live with an alien people where he lacks the protection of his own kin and so puts himself under the protection of a particular clan or chieftain of that people. It is probably best translated into English by the word "immigrant," although this does not bring out the full significance of the original. The גר is the opposite of the native born; he is an alien and so does not enjoy the privileges of full membership in the tribe; but he does have certain privileges, and his status is accordingly one of dependence but not of absolute servitude. It is this earlier meaning of the word that we would expect in the older Hexateuchal documents, J and E, and in this we are not disappointed. In these documents גר has regularly the meaning "immigrant," and in the three passages where it is found (Gen. 15 13; Exod. 2 22; 18 3) it is used exclusively of the Hebrews as immigrants in Palestine or in Egypt.[1]

Within the JE documents is another document, the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20 22–23 19), prefaced by the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20 1–17), which scholars generally regard as distinct from the others. In this document, with its preface, גר appears five times, viz., in Exod. 20 10; 22 20 (twice); 23 9, 12, and it is quite apparent that its meaning here is slightly different from that in JE, but identical with its significance in D.[2] In both C (Book of the Covenant) and D גר refers, not to the Hebrew as an immigrant in an alien land (except incidentally in Deut. 10 19b and 23 8), but to the indigenous population of Palestine conquered by the Hebrews. The relationship between the Hebrews and the גרים is identically that of the conquering Amorites in the Old Babylonian Empire (the *awīlum* of the Hammurabi Code) and the conquered Babylonians (the *muškēnum*). The usage of גר in C and D is slightly different from that in JE, but the relationship subsisting between the גר and his over-lord is quite like that indicated in JE and is still one of subordination for the גר, as is apparent from references like Exod. 20 10; Deut. 5 14; 24 14; 29 10; 31 12, where the suffix "your" attached to גר indicates a position of inferiority and dependence; Exod. 20 10; 22 20; 23 9, 12; Deut. 5 14; 10 18; 14 29; 16 11, 14; 24 14, 17, 19, 20, 21; 26 12, 13; 27 19, where the גר is classed with those occupying a similar position of dependence, like sons, daughters, widows, orphans, and slaves; Deut. 29 10, where the גרים are definitely called wood-gatherers and water-drawers for the Hebrews; and Deut. 14 21, where it is stated that anything that has died a natural death may not be eaten by a Hebrew, but may be given to a גר or sold to a foreigner (contrast Lev. 17 15f.). The גרים are still subordinates, but no longer subordinate Hebrews. They are rather subordinate natives, and this usage of the word גר, slightly different from the original, would suggest a later date for the documents in which it is found. Scholars universally date D considerably later than JE, and likewise the fourth command (Exod. 20 5–11) in its present form, but it is not so clear that C is later. Some of it is undoubtedly earlier, but those passages in which גר is used (as well as certain others) may very well be later. In any case they reflect a later situation, a situation that is comparable to that suggested in D, and they indicate a slightly different meaning for גר from that found in JE and hence require a different rendering into English. There is no word in English that fully brings out the meaning of the Hebrew, but "resident alien" does suggest the idea and is probably as near to it as we can come.

---

[1] In Exod. 3 22 the fem. partic. of the verb גור is used to mean "guest," a meaning quite akin to that of the noun גר in JE.

[2] גר appears in the following passages in D: Deut. 1 16; 5 14; 10 18, 19; 14 21, 29; 16 11, 14; 23 8; 24 14, 17, 19, 20, 21; 26 11, 12, 13; 27 19; 28 43; 29 10; 31 12; and in D² as follows: Josh. 8 33, 35.

In the HP documents it is immediately apparent that we have entered a decidedly different milieu from that reflected in either JE or C and D, and one that is considerably later. The Hebrew is now so thoroughly identified with the land of Palestine that he is called the native born (אזרח), while the גר is a naturalized alien and hence, in so far as his rights and privileges are concerned, he is on exactly the same footing as the Hebrew. He enjoys the same rights (Num. 35 15) and is bound by the same laws, whether civil (Lev. 24 22), moral and religious (Lev. 18 26; 20 2; 24 16), or ceremonial (Exod. 12 19; Lev. 16 29; 17 8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 22 18; Num. 15 14, 26, 30; 19 10), the principle being that "the same laws hold for the native born and the גר alike" (Exod. 12 49; Lev. 24 22; Num. 9 14; 15 15, 16, 29), and like the native Hebrew the גר has to be circumcised (Exod. 12 48). From these references it is quite clear that the word גר, like its equivalent גִּיּוֹר in late Aramaic, has now the meaning "proselyte," and by this term it should be translated throughout the HP documents,[3] except in a very few instances which are now to be noted.

In most of HP the גר and the native born Hebrew are on the same footing, as already indicated, but in Lev. 25, usually assigned to H, they are not on the same footing, but bear a relation to each other similar to that reflected in D. For example, according to vv. 48ff. a Hebrew sold into servitude to a גר may be redeemed before the Jubilee, if the price can be provided, whereas according to vv. 39ff. a Hebrew sold as a slave to another Hebrew cannot be redeemed before the Jubilee; and with him he is to have the status of a hired laborer (שָׂכִיר) or a serf (תּוֹשָׁב), whereas with a גר he is to have the status of a hired laborer only and not that of a serf. Manifestly, then, the גר occupies a subordinate position to that of the Hebrew, and in the three instances where the word occurs in Lev. 25 it ought to receive the same rendering as in the Deuteronomic passages, or one similar to it, "resident alien" or the like: v. 23: "The land must not be sold in perpetuity; for the land is mine, since you are only resident aliens and serfs under[4] me;" v. 35: "If a fellow-countryman of yours becomes poor, so that his ability to meet his obligation with you fails, and you force[5] on him the status of a resident alien or a serf, and he lives under you, take no interest from him in money or in kind;" v. 47: "If a resident alien or a serf under you becomes rich, and a fellow-countryman of yours under obligation to him becomes poor, and sells himself to the resident alien or the serf under you, or to a member of the resident alien's family, even after he has sold himself, the right of redemption shall hold for him." In these passages גר is used in conjunction with תושב, indicating an inferior position socially, as it is again in Num. 35 15, which passage is decidedly reminiscent of D and in its use of גר carries the same or a similar sense: "These six cities shall serve the Israelites, as well as the resident aliens and the serfs among them, as places of refuge, so that anyone who kills another inadvertently may flee there."[6] In two other passages usually assigned to H we have a like meaning for the word, Lev.

---

[3] The occurrences are as follows: Exod. 12 19, 48, 49; Lev. 16 29; 17 8, 10, 12, 13, 15,; 18 26; 19 33, 34; 20 2; 22 18; 24 16, 22; Num. 9 14; 15 14, 15, 16, 26, 29, 30; 19 10 (doubtful passages are omitted). These passages are not correctly translated in *The Old Testament: An American Translation*, but in the forthcoming second edition they will be translated as here indicated.

---

[4] For this meaning of עִם here and elsewhere in this chapter see Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, II, 94f.

[5] For the justification of this rendering see Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, II, 94. The ordinary translation here is quite incorrect.

[6] So also Josh. 20 9, which is usually assigned to P.

19 10 and 23 22, where as in D the גר is joined with the עני as an object of charity for the Hebrew, and hence occupies a subordinate position to him.

There is one other passage that is usually, but not universally, assigned to P, viz., Gen. 23 4, where גר clearly has not the meaning "proselyte," but its original meaning "immigrant." The verse runs as follows: "Since I am an immigrant and a serf under you, give me some property with you as a burial-ground, that I may inter my dead." I differ here somewhat from my earlier translation of the verse,[7] when I was too much influenced by Ehrlich.[8] The first clause is circumstantial, and the waw in גר ותושב can scarcely be adversative. תושב is a further description of the status of Abraham and manifestly indicates a status similar to that of the serf in Europe in the Middle Ages,[9] as is suggested by the context here and elsewhere,[10] and by the defining phrase עמכם. The preposition עם here, and in certain other contexts, manifestly does not mean "along with," but "in a subordinate position to, under," as Ehrlich has well shown for several instances of the word in Lev. 25.[11] Hence the position of the גר as indicated in this passage is akin to that of a serf and is similar to that indicated in Lev. 25, differing from it only in the fact that the word carries its earlier, more accurate meaning. The deduction, then, must be that Gen. 23, although probably worked over by P and incorporated into his writings, can scarcely be his composition, but must have come from a considerably earlier time, not far removed from the time of JE. And this is an opinion not without independent support, because a goodly number of scholars agree that the chapter is not altogether in P's manner,[12] and some, like Eerdmans,[13] assign it to the oldest stratum of Genesis. Even Skinner says of it: "The passage has far more the appearance of a transcript from real life than any other section in the whole of P; and its markedly secular tone (the name of God is never once mentioned) is in strong contrast to the free introduction of the divine activity in human affairs which is characteristic of that document. It seems probable that the narrative is based on some local tradition by which the form of the representation has been partly determined."[14] It is quite apparent, then, that the use of גר in Gen. 23 simply confirms opinions already held rather widely regarding the chapter.

---

[7] *The Old Testament: An American Translation*, p. 34.

[8] *Op. cit.*, I, 99.

[9] The root meaning of the word is "settler," from the root יָשַׁב, "to settle, dwell."

[10] תושב appears elsewhere in the Hexateuch in Exod. 12 45; Lev. 22 10; 25 6, 23, 35, 40, 45, 47; Num. 35 15.

[11] *Op. cit.*, II, p. 94ff.

[12] E. g., Steuernagel, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1908, p. 628.

[13] *Alttestamentliche Studien*, I, p. 88.

Our study of the meaning of גר has accordingly led us to the conclusion that the word did not continuously retain its original significance, but in the course of long usage went through three distinct stages of meaning, which can best be represented in English by the terms "immigrant," "resident alien," and "proselyte." Of these the first represents the original meaning of the word and is found exclusively in the oldest documents, J, E, and Gen. 23, if this in its original form did not belong to JE. The last term, "proselyte," is furthest removed from the original meaning of the word and is found exclusively in the documents, H and P, which scholars for other reasons have long regarded as the latest in the Hexateuch. The other term, "resident alien," represents an intermediate period and is particularly characteristic of D, but is found also in certain laws (Exod. 20 10; 22 20; 23 9, 12) very close to the time of D, and in certain others (Lev. 19 10; 23 22; 25 23, 35, 47; Num. 35 15) not very long after D. Thus critical opinion with regard to the historical order of the Hexateuchal documents is confirmed, but the documents themselves are not to be separated too arbitrarily the one from the other as definitely distinct entities, but are to be regarded as melting the one into the other, and this is the opinion of more recent scholarship arrived at from quite independent considerations.[15]

---

[14] *Genesis* (ICC), p. 335.

[15] See, e. g., the present writer's demonstration of this in the study of certain traditions regarding the Hebrew priesthood, "Aaronites and Zadokites," *AJSL*, XLV, 149ff. The various documents, like ancient writings in

When we turn to the translation of גר in the Septuagint, it is striking, almost startling, to find in how many particulars our conclusions are verified. It is not at all suggested that the translators of the Septuagint knew the documents J, E, D, H, and P, but it is quite evident that they did recognize different meanings for גר in different contexts, because they used various words to translate it and the different words are used too consistently to be explained as due to the caprice of the same translator or to the presence of different translators, except in a very few doubtful cases. The variant translations in Exod. 12 and in Deuteronomy may be due to this, but elsewhere there seem to have been more fundamental reasons for the choice of the particular Greek word. It is interesting to find, then, that the Greek translators in the documents that we know now as HP regularly reproduced גר by *προσήλυτος*.[16] This word does not necessarily mean "proselyte" in our sense of the term, but that the Septuagint did mean this in HP is indicated by a number of considerations, particularly by the translation of גור, the verbal form of גר which so often accompanies it. In Lev. 20 2 the expression מִן־הַגֵּר הַגָּר is translated by *ἀπὸ τῶν γεγενημένων προσηλύτων*, which can only mean "out of those who have become proselytes." In Lev. 18 26; 20 2 (Codex A); Num. 15 14 גור is translated by *προσγίγνομαι*; in Exod. 12 48, 49; Lev. 19 33; Num. 9 14 by *προσέρχομαι*; in Exod. 12 49 (Codex A); Lev. 16 29; 17 8, 10, 12, 13; 25 6; Num. 15 15, 16, 26, 29; 19 10; Josh. 20 9 by *πρόσκειμαι*; and in Lev. 19 34; Num 15 26 (Codex A) by *προσπορεύομαι*. All of these Greek verbs have the meaning of attaching oneself to, uniting with, and indicate the kind of action that a proselyte has to follow in identifying himself with an alien group. Manifestly, then, the translators of the Septuagint meant

---

general, are not the product, each of a single pen in a particular era, but the accumulation of centuries, a literary snow-ball that has rolled down the avenues of time, gathering more and more material, often of diverse character, the further it rolled.

[16] The one exception is Exod. 12 19 where *γειώρας* is used, but in certain manuscripts and in Aquila and Symmachus the more usual *προσήλυτος* appears. *γειώρας* is an unusual word and is found elsewhere only in Isa. 14 1.

by προσήλυτος, at least in the later portions of the Hexateuch, HP, what we mean by "proselyte," and so one of our earlier conclusions is thus confirmed.

When we turn to the other portions of the Hexateuch, we are immediately struck by the fact that none of the verbs used to translate גור in HP is anywhere thus used in what we call J, E, and D,[17] manifestly because the translators correctly recognized a difference in meaning here, but not probably a difference in authorship. Throughout J, E, and D the regular translation of גור is the more appropriate παροικέω,[18] which is used for this purpose in P only in Gen. 17 8; 35 27; 47 9; Exod. 6 4, all of these instances indicating the sojourn of the early Hebrew patriarchs in Canaan, where a verb suggesting the idea of joining as a proselyte would be inappropriate. Similarly, the regular translation of גר in JE is πάροικος, which is never once used for this purpose in HP, but it is used there as the translation of תושב, "serf" (viz., in Exod. 12 45; Lev. 22 10; 25 6, 23, 35, 40, 45, 47; Num. 35 15), which word has a meaning akin to that of גר in the early period, as we have already noted. On the other hand, προσήλυτος, the regular translation of גר in HP, is never once found in JE, but it is used for this purpose in C and in D, along with πάροικος (Deut. 14 21; 23 8). It is possible that the Greek translators used προσήλυτος in C and D to mean "proselyte," but it is more likely that they used the word here in a slightly different sense from the same word in HP, because πάροικος interchanges with προσήλυτος in D, and in both C and D the verb used to translate גור is never one of those used in HP, but παροικέω (Exod. 20 10; Deut. 5 14; 18 6; 26 5).[19] Hence our conclusions with regard to C and D would seem to be verified, in part at least, by the Greek translation.

It is striking, too, to note that the Septuagint in Gen. 23 4 translates גר by πάροικος, as against the later προσήλυτος, suggesting that this chapter is not strictly a part of P, as we have already contended. In Lev. 25, however, the regular translation is προσήλυτος, but the word is manifestly used in its earlier Deuteronomic sense, as suggested by the use of παροικέω to translate גור in v. 6 and the conjunction of the word with πάροικος in vv. 23, 35, 47. The same is true of Num. 35 15, where again προσήλυτος is used in conjunction with πάροικος, and probably also of Lev. 19 10; 23 22, where the word is used in conjunction with πτωχός.

---

[17] It is to be noted, however, that προσπορεύομαι is used in Josh. 8 35, which is usually assigned to D^2, and hence is fairly close to the time of P.

[18] The one exception is Exod. 3 22, where the fem. partic. גָּרָה is translated σύσκηνος.

[19] The verb גור does not actually appear in the Hebrew text of the first two passages, but was understood by the Greek translators.

It is apparent, then, that the Greek translators were well aware of the fact that גר had different meanings in different contexts and their translations accord quite well with those that we had reached independently. Their translations for this reason lend some support to the documentary hypothesis, but it is very improbable that they were consciously aware of different documents in the Hexateuch. However, in being reasonably faithful to the meaning of the original they at least suggest the presence of older and later writings.

A JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN SOURCE IN LUKE

A. M. PERRY
BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

(1) The brief section, Luke 11 33—36 presents a complex of difficulties, due in part to the obscurity of the thought, which is probably responsible for the significant textual variation. Verse 33 is a doublet of Lk. 8 16 (= Mk. 4 21), which is also its closest parallel. Its verbal agreement with the Mark verse is 40%; its agreement with Matt. 5 15 is the same. Matthew-Luke contacts are limited to the accusative λύχνον, possibly due to independent improvement of Mark. It would seem more probable that we have here two, if not three, independent versions of a striking saying easily transmitted orally:—that of Luke 11 33 with its application in vv. 34—36, that of Mark 4 21 with a different application (its parallel in Lk. 8 16 being somewhat assimilated to 11 33), and also that of Matt. 5 15,—unless this be a free adaptation of Lk. 11 33.[1]

Verses 34—35 have close verbal agreement, 87 percent, with Matthew and seem drawn from a common document; yet they can hardly have stood alone but are rather an application of v. 33.[2] Verse 36 is a secondary expansion, so obscure and banal that it would scarcely be used by both evangelists: it might equally well be merely editorial, and, like most editorial "explanations," it adds to the confusion.

To conclude, while v. 33 is easily separated from vv. 34—36, the whole section stands by itself without connection either with what precedes or with what follows. It has, too, an enigmatic and figurative form which sets it apart quite largely from the materials of G (even, one would say, Lk. 6 38, 39, 41, which surely are not so obscure). Its manner, too, suggests rather the teacher than the prophet. But, aside from editorial expansion, it seems to be derived from a common source.

---

[1] Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae*^{2}, p. 99.

[2] Bultmann, R., *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, S. 51.

(2) Luke 11 37—54, the Woes upon the Pharisees and Lawyers, has a general parallel in Matthew 23. Harnack assigns to Q vv. 39, 42, 44, 46—52, and this list includes all the apparent parallels except v. 43, which has a Mark parallel as well. Of these verses, vv. 39, 42, 47—51 have more than 50 percent verbal agreement; and it should further be noted that they represent practically a single block in the Matthew discourse as well (Mt. vv. 25, 23, 29—32, 34—36) and in nearly the same order,—so that a common source for these, at least, must be assumed. Matthew conflates Luke 11 43 with Mark 12 39, preserving Mark's location (= Mt. vv. 6—7) and Mark's additional phrase, but giving the phrases the same order as Luke (= Q). It may be assumed, then, that Matthew found it in his source, at the Lukan location. Verse 52 has a Matthew parallel at a different location, Mt. v. 13, the verbal agreement is less (41 percent), and the language is as different as it well could be, so that these would seem to be logia independently transmitted. Verse 44, though its Matthew parallel is in the Q block (v. 27), has no verbal agreement beyond the introductory words, and the whole point of the simile is quite different, making independent transmission again the more probable explanation. The same is true of v. 46 (= Mt. v. 4): the verbal agreement is slight, and the language differs as widely as could well be, while the Matthew parallel is removed to the introductory section and ceases to be a "woe" at all. Only vv. 39, 42—43, 47—51, then, can be picked out with much certainty as belonging to the common source.

The relation of the remaining materials to this nucleus must next be determined. Verses 40—41 form the conclusion to v. 39 and could hardly have stood alone. Their meaning is quite obscure, which may account for Matthew's replacing them with an observation (Mt. v. 26) which is not only banal but false, and may well be editorial. Verse 40, however, connects well with v. 39, and, as Easton remarks.[3] "contains the real motive for Christ's saying;" and v. 41 has, in ἐλεημοσύνην and καθαρά, the antitheses of ἁρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας in v. 39. The phrase δότε ἐλεημοσύνην appears elsewhere only at Luke 12 33. As to the thought, v. 40 serves to link the metaphor of v. 39 with its occasion in v. 38, and v. 41 (perhaps bracketing τὰ ἔνοντα) points the moral. The three verses must then have formed a single block in the source, and v. 38 was probably joined with them.

Verse 44 is linked to v. 39 by the fact that it deals with ceremonial purity (cf. Numb. 19 16); and this is more prominent in the Lukan version than in the Matthew parallel (Mt. v. 27), which repeats the superficial contrast only and appears in every way less original. Luke repeats μνημεῖον in v. 47, but elsewhere as well. It is difficult to suppose that Luke could have incorporated this verse, with its intensely Jewish background and its general obscurity, unless he had found it standing in his source. In v. 52 the "key of knowledge" (or, of the Kingdom) is evidently the Torah, which the scribes have obscured by their "interpretation," and the charge that they are erring guides repeats that of vv. 42, 44. The reference to the particulars of Jewish faith is in line with the previous references to defilement and purification (vv. 39, 44) and to tithes (v. 42) and appears in a more original form in Luke than in Matthew. In v. 46 the "burden of the scribes" must be identified as the scribal "interpretations," which include all the ceremonial matters above: so the verse is closely connected with v. 52, and the charge of preaching and not practicing is also in line with the attack on externalized religion in vv. 39, 42.

The remaining verses are narrative, and might easily be attributed to the editor, or if they stood in the source would naturally have been omitted by Matthew. Verse 37 presents a peculiarly Lukan situation (cf. 7 36, 14 1, etc.) which Mark handled quite differently (cf. Mk. 2 16, 7 2). We have already seen, however. that v. 38 has inner connection with the source. V. 45 is perhaps not entirely Lukan, for "Luke does not usually take technically Jewish distinctions quite so much for granted"[4] and the word *νομικός* though usually called "Lukan" is in fact found only in the non-Markan sections of Luke (7 30; 10 25; 14 3, and the present section, —cf. *γραμματεῖς* in v. 53). The substitution of *γραμματεῖς* in the colorless conclusion, vv. 53—54, suggests a difference of authorship; but these latter verses are so similar to Mark 12 13 (= Mt. 22 15) that Matthew would have omitted them at this point in any case.

---

[3] Easton, B. S., *Gospel according to St. Luke*, p. 193.

The discourse in Luke has a formal unity,—an introduction, followed by three woes on Pharisees and three on scribes, in all of which there is a pervasive Jewish coloring. But within it there seem to be two strains. The first consists of a sharply directed attack upon legalism, vv. 39—42, 44, 46, 52, interrupted by two passages of more general nature, vv. 43, 47—51,—and it is notable that the second group contains the most significant of the Matthew parallels. Yet it does not help us to seek here a criterion for Luke's sources; for vv. 39, 42 have sure parallels in Matthew, also, and vv. 41, 44, 46, likewise have points in common with Matthew verses, while the contention of vv. 47—48 that the scribe pays a formal allegiance to the externals of the past, while he hates its inner genius, *does* make contact with the other element of the section, though it is obscurely expressed. It is apparent, then, that the combination of these two elements was made before the materials were used by Matthew and Luke, and so we may conclude that Luke 11 37—54 represents a single source, with Lukan editorial touches in vv. 37, (45 a), 53—54.

This discourse has been used by Matthew in a single block (Mt. 23 23—36) substituting a different saying for Luke v. 44 (= Mt. v. 27—28), transposing Luke vv. 39, 42 (= Mt. vv. 25, 23) to improve the connection, and transposing Luke v. 43 to correspond with the Mark location (= Mt. vv. 6—7).

The characteristics of this passage are noteworthy. In contrast to Luke 6 24—26 the point of friction is not social status but a religious scruple (v. 38), and the whole attack is upon religious grounds. This is not a class struggle (as in G) but a sectarian controversy.

---

[4] *ibid.*, p. 194.

Distinctively Jewish ideas are therefore present, and emphasis is thrown on almsgiving as a religious duty (vv. 41, 42), on tithing (v. 42), on ritual purity (v. 44), on the scribal "tradition," with the assumption that it must be obeyed (v. 46), on the Torah as the "key" to saving knowledge (v. 52),—and perhaps we should include here the concept of blood vengeance (vv. 47–51). The responsibility of the teacher or scribe is especially indicated (vv. 44, 46, 52). All this has the aspect of a philippic against the scribes by one of their own number,—and in the conclusion they take a scribal method (vv. 53–54) of discrediting him.[5] The eschatological note also creeps in not only in the "woe," but particularly in the warning of punishment (vv. 50–51).

A few G contacts do appear, however. Interest in the poor appears in v. 39, — *ἁρπαγή* and perhaps *ἐλεημοσύνην*. Interest in the prophets, also, is found in vv. 47, 49; but, aside from Matthew's *σταυρώσετε* (Mt. v. 34), it is the disciples rather than Jesus himself who are compared to the prophets of old (cf. also Lk. 6 23). Pharisees appear only in two sections of G:—Simon in Luke 7 36–37, 39, and the sect in 7 30. The obscurity of much of the language here (esp. vv. 40–41, (44), 48, 52) forms a link with vv. 33–36.

(3) Luke 12 1–12. Verse 1a is clearly editorial. The saying, v. 1b, is so brief and epigrammatic that oral tradition could account for it,—or even a fleeting recollection of Mk. 8 15. It may be assumed that the explanation ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις, is editorial, and links up with the "Woes" of the preceding section (cf. 11 39, 44, 47) as does the reference to Pharisees.

Verses 2–9 are quite closely paralleled in Matt. 10 26–33 and the verbal differences are pretty clearly due to editorial improvements, while the section, being composed of four units, could hardly have been transmitted orally without greater modification. Verses 2–3 have much of the obscurity of the sections just preceding; and other differences from G appear: the emphasis on confession (v. 8, contrast Lk. 6 46), Hebrew metrical parallelism which replaces G's triplets (vv. 2–3, 8–9), the ascetic trend of vv. 4–5, and the eschatological interest of both vv. 4–5 and vv. 8–9. The whole section has a background of persecution, and while persecution appears in G (cf. 6 23) it is not there severe, but here the loss of life is contemplated (vv. 4, 7,—are the "confessors" of v. 8 martyrs, as later?)

---

[5] It is perhaps possible to find here not merely a scribal, but a Sadducean note. The Torah is upheld (v. 52) against the "traditions" (v. 46), among which are the washings (v. 39ff.), petty tithes (v. 42), and possibly the exaltation of the prophets (v. 47f.), while the defilement which is accepted as real (v. 44) rests on a Pentateuchal command.

Verse 10 has a Markan parallel (Mk. 3 28–29) with which Matthew conflates it, somewhat awkwardly. V. 10a is in close agreement with Matthew; but v. 10b has two surprising agreements with Mark, which may however be accounted for as removed in Matthew by editorial improvements. The verse seems to some extent a doublet of the preceding vv. 8–9, as well as of Mark 3 28–29,—evidence of considerable popularity in the oral tradition; but its position in Luke is strange unless the evangelist found it in his source at this point, and Matthew's transfer to conflate with Mark is in accordance with his usual procedure. Like much of the material of this panel of the gospel, the verse is obscure. The emphasis on confession links it with the preceding verse.

Verses 11–12 have considerable verbal agreement (43 percent) with Matthew 10 19–20. The latter, however, is from Mark, and the contacts with Luke (tense of *μεριμνήσητε*, and *πῶς ἤ*) are perhaps accidental, though they gain in significance from the fact that vv. 2–9 are used by Matthew in the same chapter. The connection of these verses is poor, however, either with v. 10 or with v. 9, though they would fit well between v. 7 and v. 8. Yet they are connected with vv. 2–9 by the general background of persecution, with vv. 8–9 by the thought of confession, and with vv. 2–3 by the reference to speaking. The reference to the Holy Spirit also connects v. 10 with v. 12; for these are the only places in Luke where the phrase has the form *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, and (with the possible addition of 3 22, 1 35, 2 26) the only places where a *personal* connotation is definitely required. Representation of the synagogue as a stronghold of persecution (v. 11, cf. 21 12) is in accord with the general attitude of the "woes" preceding (cf. esp. 11 43): in G the synagogue is favored (cf. Lk. 4 15–30; 7 5). The verb *μεριμνᾶν* appears elsewhere in Luke only in 10 41 and the section 12 22–26 (ter). It seems probable, therefore, that vv. 10–12 were attached to vv. 2–9 in Luke's source before it came into his hands.

With this we conclude the review[6] of Canon Streeter's second "block of Q;" and the detailed analysis goes to support his conclusion that the materials lay before the evangelist (even when composing Proto-Luke) as a continuous document,—save that we should add that Luke 11 1–32 were drawn from one source, "G," and Luke 11 33–12 12 from a different document, which we may designate for the present as "N."

Luke 12 13–21. Streeter does not assign to Q, and his third "block of Q" begins with Luke 12 22. See the discussion below, page 188.

(1) In the Discourse on Worry, Luke 12 22–31 and Matt. 6 25–33 must beyond question have been drawn from a common source, and these verses are linked also to the common material of N. The principal note of the passage is ascetic,—a gentle otherworldliness full of pious trust and abnegation,—contrasting with the actual consciousness of hunger and privation which G exhibits. A like unfaltering trust is inculcated in N (Lk. 12 6–7, 11–12).

Eschatology is absent here, but other aspects of Jewish thought are marked: contempt for Gentiles (v. 30, contrast Lk. 6 32–34), national appropriation of God in the phrase ὑμῶν ὁ πατήρ (v. 30), a very Hebraic use of ψυχή = "appetite" (v. 22), and the Semitic parallelism of the poetry (cf. esp. vv. 22, 23, 24,—but for the last Matt. has a triad). The comparison with birds forms another slight link with Lk. 12 7, as the verb μεριμνᾶν does with Luke 12 11 (elsewhere in Lk. only 10 41). But the most striking characteristic of the section is its unworldly detachment, so complete that the passage leaves few indications of social setting upon which the student can take hold.

Luke 12 33–34 have considerable agreement (52 percent) with Matt. 6 19–21, and the fact that both evangelists insert this section in connection with the preceding, though in different order, is good evidence that it stood in the same source. Transposition by Matthew, in the construction of his discourse, is more likely than by Luke, and seems further indicated by the interruption of Matt. vv. 22–24, even though Matt. v. 19 connects well with Luke v. 21. This last fact, however, would indicate that Luke's language is secondary at some points, especially the "Lukan characteristics"[7] τὰ ὑπάρχοντα and βαλλάντια (v. 33). The ascetic interest of the preceding section continues, and develops here to a true "interim ethic." The reference to alms as a good work recalls that of Luke 11 41.

---

[6] See *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XLVII (1928), pp. 104—116.

The intervening verse, Luke 12 32, is apparently an interpolation. It has no good connection on either side, and would fit better with the paragraph Luke 12 2–9 (so Wellhausen, *Lukasevangelium*, p. 66). It seems also to imply in part some such reversal of values as that of Luke 6 20–21. Yet there is a certain connection with v. 31; for the injunction there finds its complement in the assurance that the search for the Kingdom *will* succeed, while the phrase ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν appears also in the preceding verse (v. 30). The eschatological note which appears here, however, is not found earlier in the section, and it is difficult to take "Kingdom" in the same sense in both v. 31 and v. 32. The verse may therefore be an interpolation, though its omission by Matthew in his transposition of material would have been easy.

(2) The section on Covetousness, Luke 12 13–21, stands in close relation to the section discussed above. The thought of the passage, as expressed in v. 15 has the same ascetic note as the verses which follow it, and the Hebraic use of ψυχή (v. 19, but not v. 20, cf. vv. 22–23) and the reference to "barns" (v. 18, cf. v. 24) make the superficial connection quite close. This is further strengthened by the connection of v. 21 (wanting however in Codex Bezae) with Matt. 6 19. If it stood in the common source N, Matthew would have disliked the curt disclaimer of v. 14 (cf. Mt. 19 17), and would have found both the narrative and the parable out of place in his Great Sermon. The whole section, therefore, has been given to Q by Easton;[8] and vv. 13–15 were formerly attributed to Q by Streeter.[9]

[7] Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 35—51.

[8] Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

[9] Streeter, B. S., in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 193.

On the other hand, the section bears some marks of interpolation. Though its own connection with v. 22 is good, it disturbs an equally good connection of v. 12 with v. 22. In vv. 13–16 the "Lukan characteristics" are especially frequent (13 in the four verses), while the parable has the vividness and fulness of other narrative parables peculiar to Luke. There are some contacts with G also:—"not by bread alone" (v. 15, cf. 4 4), the anger against the rich (cf. 6 24, etc.), the peasant viewpoint which regards any freeholder as wealthy (v. 16b). Other interests, which may be "Lukan," are the implied call to repentance, especially in v. 21, and the thought that death is a punishment (cf. 13 1–9). It should be noted, too, that the judgement comes with death, not with the Parousia,—a further contrast with the eschatological outlook of vv. 11–12, 32–34. The balance of evidence, therefore, inclines toward Streeter's later view[10] that this in an interpolation between blocks of Q, or, as we should say, N.

(3) The Discourse on Watching, Luke 12 35–48, has a number of parallels in Matthew's Eschatological Discourse (Mt. 24—25). The passages Luke 12 39–40, 42–46 (= Mt. 24 43–51) are in very close agreement with Matthew, in language, word-order, and verse sequence, and a common source for these is certain. Verse 41 is an editorial transition, with a high proportion of "Lukan characteristics" (5), and no earlier source need be sought.

This section has many of the characteristics of the common source N. The enigmatic quality of the sayings is marked, in v. 39, and in the way the parables of vv. 42–46 are introduced and applied. The eschatology is strongly marked, indeed this passage affords the first clear reference in Proto-Luke to the Parousia (vv. 40, 43, 46, cf. v. 37). The asceticism of the interim ethic appears in v. 45, and the idea of reward for individual religious loyalty has a definitely Jewish aspect, as has the ("Pauline") phrase *μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων* (v. 46), while the reversal of status is placed in this passage on moral grounds (contrast Lk. 6 24–26). The parabolic verses have a large element of allegory, in distinction from the striking narrative parables peculiar to Luke (cf. 10 29–37; 12 16–20; 11 5–8). In the eschatology there are one or two notes of a later time, with reference to the delay of the Parousia (vv. 45, 39–40, cf. v. 38). Verse 40 makes a poor connection with v. 39, but it is entirely apt to v. 38.

---

[10] Id., *The Four Gospels*, p. 278.

The connection of vv. 35–38 with the common source is already clear. The thought is the same and cast in the same mould. Allegory is even more prominent (v. 37), and the enigmatic quality is also detected (esp. v. 35). There are further Jewish touches also,—the Messianic banquet (v. 37), the division of the night into *three* watches (v. 38).—and the reference to "lights" recalls that of Luke 11 33–36. Matthew would hardly have used this in addition to the parable of the Ten Virgins, which he incorporates in the same discourse.

Luke 12 47–48 form an appendix to the preceding paragraph, and there is a slight contrast between the "dismemberment" of the slave in v. 46 and the "flogging" which follows it in v. 47; but this is not a serious break in a passage the whole of which is allegorical, and it is quite possible that Matt. 24 51b is intentionally substituted for v. 47. It is more significant, perhaps, that vv. 45–46 counsel watchfulness, while the point of v. 47 is, rather, faithful service. Yet the Jewish coloring still persists, and v. 47, which may well have applied to the scribe as teacher of the Torah (though Luke might interpret of Gentile and Jew in the church), recalls the strictures of Luke 11 46, 44, 52. Verse 48b, which is an independent logion, capable of transmission orally or in a document, contrasts with the frequently repeated saying of Luke 8 18 (= Mk. 4 25) and 19 26 (= Mt. 25 29). It is epigrammatic, but not so enigmatic as some other verses of the common source N. We must conclude, then, that these verses, though connected quite closely with the preceding, offer no clear proofs of their origin.

The source N is now supposed to have included the following sections:

(1) The Light in the Darkness	Luke 11 33–36	= Matt. 6 22–23
(2) The Six Woes	11 38–52	= 23 6 f; 23–36
(3) (The Leaven of the Pharisees)	12 1b	= cf. Mk 8 15

(4) On Bearing Persecution	12 2–12	= Matt. 10 26–33, 17–19, 12 32
(5) On Worry	12 22–31	= 6 25–33
(6) The True Treasure	12 32–34	= 6 19–21
(7) On Watching	12 35–40	= 24 43–44
(8) The Faithful Servants	12 42–46 (48)	= 24 45–51

Bits of editorial setting and adaptation appear in Luke 11 37, (45), 53–54, 12 1a, (32), 41; and the block Luke 12 13–21 seems to have been derived from a different source.

This panel of the gospel has, likewise, an inner consistency and progress which is worthy of note. Conceived as the product of a Jewish Christian body content to remain a sect *within* the Jewish fold, it is entirely self-consistent. § 1, with its striking and enigmatic symbolism, demands loyalty to the truth, and so forms an apt introduction, leading up to the indictment of the established sects in § 2. This indictment is definitely anti-Pharisaic and has some contacts with Sadducean thought; but the ascetic note which echoes even here, and later sounds strongly, suggests rather an affiliation with Essene practice. § 4 conveys comfort and encouragement for the new sect in its struggle to gain its footing beside the old, §§ 5—6 deal with the privation its adherents must risk, and with their unseen allies; and §§ 7—8, with a promise of reward for faithfulness, form a fitting conclusion to the whole.

The materials of this panel, it will be noted, are very largely Q materials, and, while the Luke-Matthew parallels are scattered, they consist for the most part of blocks of several verses each. But beyond this point, (Lk. 12 48 (46)), the Luke-Matthew contacts are few and scattered and, except for the Q-apocalypse (Lk. 17 20–37) and a pair of parables (Lk. 13 18–21), they never consist of more than a verse or two.[11] This suggests the possibility of some further change of editorial treatment by either Luke or Matthew, and should make us cautious in drawing analogies from the earlier section for the later, as it might be an indication of diversity of source.

---

[11] On the apparent exceptions, Lk. 15 4–7; 19 11–27, see discussion of these passages in *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XLVIII, (1929), pp. 208—210.

The character of N, as thus far recovered, may now be reviewed; though it has been remarked in passing that many of the prominent characteristics of G are wanting, or, indeed, replaced by opposing tendencies.

On the literary side, the most striking characteristic of N is the large number of enigmatic and cryptic sayings, in which the figurative form is so developed that the exact reference or meaning is uncertain and obscure (cf. Lk. 11 33, 40–41, 48, 52; 12 2–3, 10, 39, 42, 46). Judgement of the obscurity of these sayings is, of course, somewhat subjective, and lists by different students will of necessity vary. But the point of style here at issue is rather strikingly confirmed by Wickes,[12] who in giving a slightly different list of similar sayings from the whole of the Great Interpolation, finds 13 in this brief panel, N, as against 18 in all the rest of the Interpolation,—3 of them from G. Parables are wanting in this section; in their place stand either generalized observations (Lk. 11 33; 12 6, 24, 27–28, 39) or allegorical comparisons, (Lk. 11 39, 12 43–46, 35–38, 47–48). The triads of G are wanting, and the parallelism of Semitic verse is quite frequent (Lk. 12 2–3, 5, 8–10, 22–24, 27, 29, 35, and cf. Moffatt's translation). Actual quotation of the Old Testament is not found, nor reminiscence of Old Testament language: instead there are allusive references to the laws (Lk. 11 44), or to Old Testament characters (Lk. 11 51, 12 27).

One of the most marked characteristics of the source is a pervasive atmosphere of Jewish legalism, almost of Pharisaism. The Torah is respected as an absolute authority (Lk. 11 42, 52, cf. 16 17, and contrast 16 16, 18; 17 1, etc.), and the "tradition," though galling, is also assumed to be essential (Lk. 11 46, 52). Attention is paid to the detailed rules regarding ceremonial purity (11 39, 44), tithes (11 42), and almsgiving (11 41, 42; 12, 33); and scribes (11 45–52, 53; 12 47) and Pharisees (11 37–44; 12 1), though rebuked, are held to a high ideal. These details are largely from a single section; but the background of Jewish ideas is found elsewhere: the synagogue as a favored place of religious instruction seems hinted at (11 43; 12 47), though it is also referred to as a court of persecution (12 11). The view of God is particularistic (12 30) and there is a marked contempt for gentiles (12 30, 46). The prophets of old are revered as figures of the past (11 47–49), and specific Jewish ideas also appear: the concept of blood-vengeance as transferred to God (11 47–51), the idea of the Messianic banquet (12 37), the use of ψυχή for "appetite" (12 22, cf. 12 19), and the division of the night into three watches instead of four (12 38).

---

[12] Wickes, D. R., *Sources of Luke's Perean Section*, p. 38.

Above all, the eschatology marks the Jewish coloring of the whole. Four of the sections are pervaded by the apprehension of impending world-catastrophe, and a fifth has this note at the end (§§ 4, 6, 7, 8, and 2b). These include at least 24 verses with eschatological coloring, out of the whole number (58) ascribed to N. This gives unusual prominence to eschatological thought in this panel of the gospel, although it is restrained and we have here no formal apocalypse. The idea of Divine judgement is brought in frequently (Lk. 11 50; 12 8–9, 10, 43, 46, 47–48) with a promise of reward according to deserts (12 33, 37, 43), which is sometimes depicted as a reversal of present status (12 32, 43, 45). Gehenna is once mentioned as a place for torment (12 5). The Parousia is definitely alluded to in the last sections (12 37–38, 40, 43, 46), but without identification of the person of the Messiah. In view of these expectations, the disciples are exhorted to watchfulness (12 36–37, 39, 45–46), to boldness in confessing their faith (12 8, 11–12) and in preaching (12 2–3, 11–12), and to brave endurance of persecution (11 49; 12 2, 4, 7, 11–12). In ethics there is an ascetic tone (12 22–23, cf. 12 15), emphasizing a passive trust (12 22–31, cf. 12 6–7, 11–12) that at times amounts almost to fatalism (12 4–5), and that becomes a true interim ethic at some points (12 33–34, 45). The warning against covetousness (12 15) in a section not assigned to N, has less of this ascetic tone.

Other marks of the social environment are few. Note may be made of the possible interest in the poor implied in the injunction to give alms (11 41, 12 33),—unless this is merely a "good work,"—and in the complaint against extortion (11 39) and injustice (11 42). There is also an implied comparison of the disciples (not their Master) with the prophets (11 47, 49), and reference to their inspiration by the Holy Spirit (12 12). In this section, too, there occur the only two references in Luke which *require* a *personal* conception of the Holy Spirit (12 10, 12, cf. also 3 22; 1 35; 2 26) as against a possibly *quantitative* conception.

A few words or phrases largely confined, in Luke, to this panel may be noted: *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην* (11 41; 12 33), the order of the phrase *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα* (12 10, 12), and the verb *μεριμνᾶν* (12 11, 22–26, cf. 10 41); and half of the occurrences of the "Lukan" word *νομικός* (never found in Markan sections, however) are in the "woes" (11 45–52, cf. 7 30, 10 25, 14 3).

Indications of provenance are scanty. There is a reference to Jerusalem at one point (11 51), but perhaps from a distance. The most noteworthy feature is the great preponderance of Jewish coloring; which takes the form of an acceptance of fundamental Pharisaic teaching and Essene asceticism, with an almost Sadducean attack upon the Pharisees. But anything specifically Christian is almost entirely wanting in this panel of the gospel. This suggests an origin in some circle of ultraconservative Jewish Christians similar to that over which James the Just presided. The name "Nazarean," applied to these Christians and to their later remnants, is therefore appropriate for this source, and the symbol "N" may be used as a convenient designation.

THE OPTIMISM OF KOHELETH

CARL S. KNOPF
VISITING PROFESSOR
YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

SOME years ago in an issue of "*The Personalist*,"[1] a philosophical magazine published at the University of Southern Calif.,the writer presented a tentative approach to the much abused book of Ecclesiastes which involved a recognition of possible currents of philosophic speculation that were contemporary with Koheleth.

Since then, the writer has taken occasion to carry further a word study of the opening chapter in the light of Assyro-Babylonian roots, with the result that there has emerged an even stronger conviction that past exegesis has neglected an important aspect of Koheleth, and that a splendid bit of practical philosophy has been relegated into the limbo of scripture to be put up with but not taken seriously.

Of course, any composite book may have several strands running through it. After the view herein presented it will be easy enough to remark "but how about—?" The point is, that too often the whole cast of the book has been determined by certain possible pessimistic elements, ignoring just as patent constructive elements. If it is to be a matter of choice, at least it is permissible to choose some strand that yields the greatest spiritual value and that better meets the eternal quest of the race for light. Scientific exegesis does not demand validity of the negative to the exclusion of the positive.

---

[1] July, 1925, The Re-instatement of Ecclesiastes.

The pressing problems of the Greek period are too well known to review here. The onward sweep of Greek culture and philosophy after Alexander's conquest was sure to arouse conflict in Jewish minds. Koheleth reads like the sketchy outline of a class discussion between sage and youthful disciples. The first question, "What is worth while?" is the inevitable query of youth in a changing order.

The question was intensified by the Heraclitic elements in current philosophy. If the translators of the Bible had not taken themselves so seriously, and had known the setting of the book, they might have intuitively associated the Heraclitic philosophy of ceaseless flux with the Hebraic term, הֶבֶל. The 'Zeitgeist' of Ecclesiastes imperatively demands that the search for term meanings be guided by the possible needs of those who used the words. Psychology may be a nebulous science, but it will shed measurable light on many problems of textual criticism. A scientific Geneva is badly needed in the mêlée of modern scholarship.

Keeping this and the Heraclitic philosophy in mind, הֶבֶל leaps into vivid significance. "To be as a vapour," "vaporous," hence "nothingness," "vanity," says the dictionary, and seventeenth century interpreters of religion would agree. But the characteristic of cloud or vapor is restless, unceasing change. The cloud is in a perpetual state of becoming. הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים is Hebrew superlative, "change of changes" or "exceeding great change," "ceaseless change,"—*all is change.*

Here is Hebrew philosophy coming to grips with a popular Hellenistic element. Koheleth's linguistic problem was probably as torturing as that of those who would discuss a modern complex world in classical Hebrew terms. It demands many a twist and subtle connotation, but in the light of modern time, the meaning of the revived vocabulary is clear. Koheleth had to fight fire with fire, philosophy with philosophy, verbiage with verbiage. He was not unmindful of Greek concepts. He could accommodate his tongue to them as glibly as any, so he took up the gauntlet in Heraclitic terms.

הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים, saith Koheleth, thus admitting the first contention of the rising generation. Everything is change. But if all the world is a-change, what is worth while? What is fixed?

Again picturing sage and disciples, מַה־יִּתְרוֹן לָאָדָם, what *is left* to a man? יִתְרוֹן is not limited to such terms as "profit," or "reward," or "advantage." The Assyrian *ataru* signifies "left over,"[2] "exceed," or "abound."[3] Out of life's ebullition, what abounds? What exceeds all else? What is left?[4] Furthermore, בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ suggests not only "toil" in muscular sense, but "trouble," or "opaqueness"[5] (Assyrian) or "lifting." Here is subtle humor. These dapper Greeks, these self-important σπερμολόγοι, who would carry the weight of the universe on their turgid logic! Very well, what is left after the furrowed brow has registered the heavy cerebration within?

It has all happened before. Each generation is sure that none other was so bright, or so beset with problems דּוֹר הֹלֵךְ וְדוֹר בָּא. דּוֹר Assyrian *duru*, suggests not only generations but cycles that come and go—the recurrent agitation of an evolving homo. There is a twinkling eye as the sage reminds his youthful followers that ages come and go, rising generations chafe and seethe, but הָאָרֶץ לְעוֹלָם עֹמָדֶת, the universe ploughs along on schedule. It is a tremendously steadying thought, couched in solid, simple Hebrew.

The הוּא שָׁם, in verse five, has presented difficulties to the commentators.[6] Some have deleted it entirely. In the spirit of the sage, it may be retained, perhaps not as classic style, but none the less meaningful Hebrew. The sun rises and sets, and struggles up again and lo, הוּא שָׁם. The Greek dazzled Jewish youth, lost in the skepticism of the new day, needs to be reminded that the world moves on, law still operates, some things are still fixed. The sun rises, sets, rises again and "there he is!" הוּא שָׁם may suggest syntactical difficulties, but one feels that the students of Koheleth got much more than syntax out of it.

---

[2] Muss Arnolt, *Assyrisch-Englisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, I, 133.

[3] Lyon, D. G. *An Assyrian Manual*, p. 108.

[4] So Genung, *Words of Koheleth*, p. 215 note.

[5] Bezold, C., *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar*, p. 40.

[6] Compare Barton's excellent note, *International Critical Commentary*, Ecclesiastes, p. 73.

Verse seven has another choice morsel. All the rivers flow to the sea, וְהַיָּם אֵינֶנּוּ מָלֵא. The *nun energicum*[7] adds weight to the evidence that this too is pedagogical subtlety. The rivers of speculation flowed incessantly. Judaism was drenched by Hellenism. Surely all this mass of philosophical cogitation would outweigh Moses and Torah! Yes, muses Koheleth, the rivers flow to the sea, but the sea is אֵינֶנּוּ מָלֵא—not yet filled up! Sly, witty, barbed, but basically sound! Floods of speculation could not drown the ocean of sober fact. The ten commandments were not thistle-down to be blown away by a puff of philosophic wind.

The notation of wisdom, folly, wine, and wealth, is not cynical; it is scientific observation of conditions on this planet. They are but elements of הֶבֶל, impermanent. Chapter three has often been interpreted as a lament of the ceaseless round of life. Instead, it is part of the basic optimism of Koheleth. We are in a world of law and order, and that kind of world must have some focal point. I cannot agree with those who look at this book through spectacles of one tint. Posit pessimism to begin with, and of course everything looks that way. Not the wearisome round of life, but the inevitable law and rationale of our world is the point developed.

This first dissertation rises to a climax in the answer given in verse 22. There is nothing better than for man to rejoice in his work, and that is his חֵלֶק. There is no evidence that חֵלֶק *must* mean 'reward' or 'profit' here, or in 2 10, 5 18 and 9 9. This is to lift by one's own exegetical bootstraps. The root denotes a possession, a deeded piece of property. It is something that cannot be taken away. Here we have Koheleth's answer to Heraclitus. In a changing world, one thing is fixed and cannot be taken away—the satisfaction in work well done is a חֵלֶק, a deeded possession. As long as there is mind and consciousness, in this world or the next, the individual has this possession. This חֵלֶק is what is left, יִתְרוֹן, out of all the vicissitudes, הֲבָלִים, of life.

---

[7] Davidson, A. B., *Hebrew Grammar*, p. 136n.

It is possible to make Koheleth a manual of pessimism, or it is possible to unravel a thread of brilliant rebuttal to Hellenistic assumption. The book is a weaving of several strands and perhaps some scholar will some day venture to hold that of several contributing minds, at least one can actually be detached through critical technique and thus revealed as the champion of a philosophy of hope that flowered above the enervating atmosphere of Hellenistic sophistication.

NOTE ON GENERAL CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN HEBREW

Dr. ROBERT GORDIS
NEW YORK CITY

GENESIS 4 15 לָכֵן כָּל הֹרֵג קַיִן שִׁבְעָתַיִם יֻקָּם has always remained a difficulty syntactically, at best only partially understood. It has been almost universally conceded[1] that יֻקָּם cannot have הֹרֵג קַיִן as subject, for the Kal passive of נקם[2] has the meaning "to be avenged"[3] and not "have vengeance visited upon one." Therefore two subjects for the word in question have been suggested: (1) Cain, (2) the murder. Whichever alternative we adopt, הֹרֵג קַיִן remains without a verb, and several explanations of its construction are current.

According to one view[4] כָּל הֹרֵג קַיִן is a casus pendens, similar to such instances as (1 Samuel 3 11) כָּל שֹׁמְעוֹ תְּצִלֶּינָה שְׁתֵּי אָזְנָיו or (Psalms 103 15) אֱנוֹשׁ כֶּחָצִיר יָמָיו.

This comparison is, however, erroneous as will be plain upon examination of the nature of the casus pendens. In the genuine instances there is always a word in the clause referring back to the suspended phrase. For example in כָּל שֹׁמְעוֹ תְּצִלֶּינָה שְׁתֵּי אָזְנָיו, the suffix of אָזְנָיו harks back to כָּל שֹׁמְעוֹ. In אֱנוֹשׁ כֶּחָצִיר יָמָיו, the suffix of יָמָיו links the clause up with אֱנוֹשׁ. This will be found to be the universal characteristic of the casus pendens, indeed its essential feature. Only in this way does אֱנוֹשׁ remain the logical and emphatic subject of כֶּחָצִיר יָמָיו. In our case, then, no casus pendens exists, as there is no connecting link with the introductory phrase כָּל הֹרֵג קַיִן to be found anywhere in the words שִׁבְעָתַיִם יֻקָּם.

---

[1] But cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 668a, who renders "vengeance be taken."

[2] Not the *Hophal*, as maintained by Delitzsch, Tuch, Brown-Driver-Briggs and others.

[3] So nearly all the commentators: Tuch, Delitzsch, Skinner et al.

[4] Adopted by Skinner, Spurrell. See Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley 116w.

The other view, maintained by Koenig,[5] offers no explanation whatever of the suspended participle, and contents itself with remarking: "Das Subjekt des Partizipialsatzes ist nicht identisch mit einem Satzteil des untergeordneten Satzes." How the participle is to be construed is left unexplained. Koenig adduces several other examples: Numbers 35 30, כָּל מַכֵּה נֶפֶשׁ לְפִי עֵדִים יִרְצַח אֶת הָרֹצֵחַ, Joshua 2 18, Proverbs 17 14, Job 41 18, where the same condition obtains as in Genesis 4 15. Besides we may also add 1 Samuel 2 13 כָּל־אִישׁ זֹבֵחַ זֶבַח וּבָא נַעַר הַכֹּהֵן which differs only in the use of the Vav.

The failure to find an explanation for these constructions is due to the erroneous conception that Biblical grammar is identical with Hebrew grammar, and the consequent failure to employ the rich stores of later Hebrew. Without doubt Biblical Hebrew should be viewed as one phase in the long history of the Hebrew language, each stage of which is intimately bound up with every other. Instead it is too often set apart and thus it suffers the consequences of its "splendid isolation".

The true explanation of the seemingly independent participle, somewhat approximated by Koenig and Delitzsch,[6] is that we are here dealing with *another variety of the conditional sentence*, perfectly legitimate and explicable when its origin is taken into account. It is well known that in order to express hypothetically general truths borne out by experience Biblical usage prefers the perfect, as in Proverbs 18 20, מָצָא אִשָּׁה מָצָא טוֹב. Yet this form is by no means exclusive. The participle, long before it emerges completely as an actual present tense, as in later Hebrew, begins to be felt as a verbal form. It is applied to the statement of general truths, at first purely nominally, but eventually more and more as a verb. Thus by the side of מצא אשה מצא טוב, Hebrew syntax may say (Proverbs 13 3) נֹצֵר פִּיו שֹׁמֵר נַפְשׁוֹ. This originally meant "The guardian of his mouth is the saviour of his life" (purely nominal), and then was taken to mean "he who guards his mouth saves his life" (verbal). Eventually it is felt as a pure condition: "if one guards his mouth, he saves his life." Of the same type are Proverbs 13 13, 20 *Kere*, 24 etc.

---

[5] Koenig: *Lehrgebäude* II, 2, 412s, who indeed quotes several Mishnic examples.

[6] Delitzsch on Genesis 415 (English translation vol. I p. 188) already speaks of it as a *virtually hypothetical protasis* (quicumque si quispiam).

From this class of conditional sentence, where the subject of the protasis is identical with that of the apodosis, it is merely one step to the use of a different subject in the apodosis.

That the use of the participle is on a plane with the use of the perfect, is demonstrated by the following Mishnah in Peah 3, 5:

לקח זה צפונו וזה דרומו זה נותן פאה לעצמו וזה נותן פאה לעצמו.
המוכר קלחי אילן בתוך שדהו נותן פאה מכל אחד ואחד.

"If one took the north end of the tree, and the other the south, each one gives *Peah*[7] for himself.

"If one sells stalks of a tree in the midst of his field, the *buyer* gives *Peah* from each one."

Two observations will here suffice:

(1) The two conditional sentences are obviously similar in intent, yet in the first section we find the perfect used, while the second uses the participle.

(2) What appears absolutely conclusive of the conditional nature of the second sentence is the fact that we have a most important change of subject. As Bertinoro points out, it is not the seller (המוכר) but the buyer (הלוקח) who is the subject of נותן פאה. Here a word=for=word translation of the clause ("the seller of stalks of a tree in the midst of his field, gives Peah from each one") gives us the very opposite of the intent of the Mishnah! What is more, in order to obtain הלוקח as the subject of נותן פאה, we are compelled to recognize in המוכר an *actual* protasis.

---

[7] Cf. Leviticus 19 9 and 23 22 for the Biblical injunction.

One more illustration where positive danger of error lurks and where nevertheless the participle is chosen in the protasis is afforded by Mishnah Demai 7, 1:

המזמין את חבירו שיאכל עמו והוא אינו מאמינו על המעשרות אומר וגו׳.

"If one invites his friend to eat with him, though he (sc. the friend) does not trust him in regard to tithes, the *guest* must say etc.)"

Here, too, failure to recognize the conditional force of המזמין would make it the subject of אומר, whereas the intent of the Mishnah is that the *guest* pronounce the formula (so Maimonides, Heller, et al.). Again we are compelled to assume an actual protasis and apodosis to extract any meaning from the construction of the Mishnah.

The explanation of the syntax of Genesis 4 15 and the analogous examples is now clear. We are dealing with genuine conditional sentences, with the participle as the protasis, where the change of subject is as regular as in any other type of condition.

Genesis 4 15 is to be translated literally: "If anyone kill Cain, he (sc. Cain) will be avenged sevenfold."

I Samuel 2 13: "If any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant would come etc."

Numbers 35 30: "If anyone kill a soul, only by witnesses shall the murderer be killed."

Joshua 2 18: "Behold when we come into the land, you shall bind etc."

Proverbs 17 13: "If one returns evil for good, evil shall not depart from his house."

Job 41 18: "If one lay at him with the sword, it will not hold."

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

Der Abschluß von Baudissin's „KYRIOS“.

Dreimal (1927 I/II, 1927 III/IV, 1928 I/II) habe ich in dieser Zeitschrift von diesem Vermächtnis des Grafen Baudissin berichtet: gegen Ende des abgelaufenen Jahres 1929, eher als man erwarten durfte, ist nun die 11. und 12. Lieferung, und damit der Schluß des Riesenwerkes in Gestalt seines vierten Teiles erschienen. Von diesem Bande kann man nicht berichten, ohne dem die Ehre zu geben, dem er so gut wie ausschließlich zu verdanken ist und gehört, dem Herausgeber Professor Otto Eissfeldt. In der Veröffentlichung dieses Werkes hat er seinem Lehrer und Freunde ein Denkmal errichtet, das an Aufwand von Mühe und Arbeit, von Liebe und Treue nicht leicht seinesgleichen findet. Der Wortlaut von Baudissins eigener Arbeit läuft im Dritten Teil zu Ende; den Kern dieses vierten und letzten bilden die „Nachträge vom Herausgeber“ S. 1—68 und „Nachträge Zweite Reihe vom Herausgeber“ S. 185—215. Eine Literatur von erstaunlichem Umfang ist hier bewältigt; was immer zur Erläuterung von Baudissins Ausführungen noch dienen mag, bis auf die jüngste Gegenwart, ist hier zusammengetragen, stets genau zu seiner Stelle und in klarer, übersichtlicher Fassung. Und selbst der Inhalt dieser Nachträge ist aufgenommen in den zweiten Hauptbestandteil dieses Bandes, die schier endlosen Register (S. 69—184. 216—223). Mit äußerster Genauigkeit, zerlegt in „Sachen, Götter, Personen, Orte, Forscher, Stellen“, die letzteren wieder in 11 Gebiete verteilt, ist hier der ganze Inhalt des Werkes gebucht, so daß es sich nun dem Leser für jedes einzelne, auch das kleinste Bedürfnis auseinander- und offenlegt. Seine Nutzbarkeit wird dadurch vervielfacht. Hier werden wir, wie S. V des Vorworts zu Teil I uns belehrt, neuen Dank schuldig, einem treuen Mitarbeiter des Herausgebers, Julius Rieger, der auch „die Last der gesamten Korrektur mit ihm getragen hat“. Eine gewaltige Summe sorgfältigster Arbeit hat er damit beigesteuert. Wie viele der Besten sonst noch das Ihrige zum vollen Gelingen beigetragen haben, sagt uns dieselbe Seite des Vorworts.

Und nun können wir nichts Besseres tun, als Eissfeldt eben dort weiter zu folgen, wenn er uns zum Abschluß des Ganzen seine eigene Stellung zu Baudissins Arbeit andeutet. Folgendes seine Worte darüber im ganzen Umfang. „In den beiden ersten Teilen seines Werkes scheint mir B. die These, daß das — seinerseits wieder von semitischer Diktion abhängige — Kyrios der Septuaginta nicht etwa Übersetzung eines älteren Adonaj ist, sondern die Bildung dieses Eigennamens veranlaßt oder doch mit veranlaßt hat, und daß dies in den letzten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderten aufgekommene Adonaj dann vielfach in den hebräischen Text eingedrungen ist und hier das ältere Jahwe zurückgedrängt oder ganz verdrängt hat, erwiesen und damit ein ebenso für den Text des Alten Testaments wie für die von ihm bezeugte Entwicklung der jüdischen Religion bedeutsames Ergebnis gewonnen zu haben. In ähnlicher Weise stellt der dritte Teil, der die Vorgeschichte des Kyrios und des Adonaj verfolgt und beide als charakteristisch verschiedene Ausstrahlungen der spezifisch-semitischen Vorstellung des Gottes als des Herrn zu verstehen sucht, das Kyrios nämlich als den seinen Verehrern zugehörenden, das Adonaj aber als den ihnen gebietenden absoluten Herrn, einen vertieften Einblick in die Art semitischer Gottesvorstellung und Religion dar. Obwohl, wie ich schon 1926 in meiner Würdigung von B.'s Lebenswerk (ZDMG 5 [80], S. 126) angedeutet habe, hier gelegentlich die Ideen den Quellen nicht abgewonnen, sondern aufgenötigt werden, und obwohl, worauf ich ebenfalls schon früher aufmerksam gemacht habe (ZDMG 8 [83], S. 21 ff.), manche von B. als spezifisch-semitisch in Anspruch genommene Erscheinung in Wahrheit etwa sumerisch oder kleinasiatisch oder auch allgemein-altorientalisch ist, kann die Richtigkeit und Wichtigkeit seiner Grundthese nicht bezweifelt werden.

Hier ist tatsächlich ein Charakteristikum der semitischen Gottesvorstellung erfaßt und unter Verarbeitung eines sehr reichen Quellenmaterials anschaulich dargestellt, und es liegt wirklich so, daß das Kyrios und das Adonaj in dieser spezifisch-semitischen Gottesanschauung ihre Wurzel haben. Über diese neu gewonnenen oder vertieften älteren Erkenntnisse hinaus ist B.'s Werk auch darum bedeutsam und programmatisch, weil es in einer Zeit, da die Erforschung des Alten Orients bei der Fülle des neu gewonnenen und sich ständig vermehrenden Materials in fast beziehungslose Einzelwissenschaften zu zerfallen droht, eine Zusammenfassung der vielen Einzelerscheinungen zu einer nach dem Wesen der Sache greifenden Synthese unternimmt. Denn solch eine Synthese muß immer das Ziel der Forschung bleiben, auch auf die Gefahr hin, daß sie schon bei ihrem Hervortreten in Einzelheiten überholt ist. Die Richtigkeit des Ganzen deckt dann einiger Einzelheiten Mängel." Man kann, wie mir scheint, einer so ruhigen Würdigung des großen Werkes seitens dessen, der wie kein anderer befähigt ist, seinen Wert zu ermessen, mit gutem Gewissen zustimmen. Hier ist uns ein grundlegendes Stück Religionspsychologie aufgetan, dessen Bewältigung wie nicht leicht etwas anderes das Eindringen in die Tiefen der semitischen Religion und Religionen ermöglicht. Für näheren Aufschluß über das ganze Werk sei auf Johannes Hehns ausführlichen Bericht in der Deutschen Literaturzeitung vom 22. Februar 1930 (Spalte 339—350) verwiesen.

Zum Schluß aber gebührt unser wärmster Dank noch dem Verleger Dr. Alfred Töpelmann, der eine so große Aufgabe auf sich genommen und aufs vortrefflichste gelöst hat. Möge der Erfolg seinen tapferen Entschluß vollauf rechtfertigen!

Universität Marburg K. Budde

HERODOTUS AND THE EARLY HEBREW HISTORIANS

HENRY THATCHER FOWLER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

AS Eduard Meyer noted many years ago: in our Western world, genuine historical literature had a wholly independent origin only among the Greeks and the Hebrews (Geschichte des Altertums, II (1910) § 131.) We cannot trace the early development of this type of literature or branch of science so adequately among the Greeks as in Israel, yet it seems safe to say that the development among the Hebrews was considerably earlier, both absolutely, in date, and relatively to other departments of literature. If that is the case, Herodotus's proud title as the "Father of History" seems very questionable.

I have found it of interest and some profit, leading to a better appreciation both of Herodotus and of the historians of ancient Israel, to compare the nine books of Herodotus with the narratives which we have from the early Hebrew historians. In this comparison, I have considered chiefly the early Judaean history and the Deuteronomic history of the kingdoms. I have tried to keep fairly distinct two points of view: (1) Historical writing as a literary art; (2) History as a science.

Historical Writing as Literature. Breasted styles the author of the Judaean history "that gifted first historian." Recall the comprehensive sweep of that early work, commonly dated four centuries before Herodotus, from the Garden of Eden to the struggle for Canaan in Judges 1, or more probably on into Samuel's time; possibly through the reign of David.

Herodotus also starts with prehistoric traditions and brings in many more of these in the course of his story, but he does not begin quite so far back as the time when no plant of the field was yet in the earth; he opens with the variant accounts of the origin of strife between Asiatics and Greeks—the rapes of Io, Medea, and Helen; but he quickly drops these to come to the more certain matter of the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus which first brought Persian into strife with Greek. The central subject of his narrative covers only the three generations from Cyrus to Xerxes; but his habit of trying to account for the origin of every name, person, place, custom, or people leads him to turn back constantly as far as tradition can carry him. Thus, Cambyses's campaign against Egypt is the occasion for devoting the entire second book to the geography, customs, and history of Egypt from Menes on.

Leaving out the pre-Abramic stories of Genesis, the central narrative of J. distinctly aims to cover in order a period of at least two centuries, or if to David, at least four centuries, in contrast to the seventy years or so of Herodotus's central theme.

The Hebrew historian seems no less interested than the Greek in the origin of everything he mentions—names, customs, industries, what not. In the effort to explain origins he is hardly more naïve than Herodotus often is. Commenting upon the statement; "it was from this Perses that the Persians took their name" (VII 61), Mr. Godley, the Loeb translator, remarks "Herodotus is always prone to base ethnological conclusions on Greek legends and the similarity of names; so in the next chapter Medea supplies the name of the Medes." Might not the same comment be made upon the practice of the early Hebrew historian, *mutatis mutandis*?

I have already remarked on Herodotus's interest in geography. He has been styled "a great geographer and a still greater anthropologist." (How and Wells, "A Commentary on Herodotus," page 50.) Despite many mistakes in details, no doubt his picture of the civilization of his own day and of the more primitive barbarism which he tried to describe in Book IV has much of real value; at any rate, it shows his intense interest in primitive society. Starting out in Book IV § 1: "After the taking of Babylon, Darius himself marched against Scythia." § 2 begins "Now the Scythians blind all their slaves," and we do not get back to Darius and his preparation for the Scythian campaign until we have had eighty chapters on the lands and peoples above the Euxine. Herodotus was certainly an enthusiastic geographer and anthropologist.

The early historian of Israel was also interested in the geographical distribution of peoples, their racial connections, primitive customs and social origins generally, but with what brevity he gives these traditions:

> "And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle. And his brother's name was Jubal; he was the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe. And Zillah she also bare Tubal-Cain, the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron, (Gen. 4 20—22)"

—the origin of three great social types: nomad, music guild, metal workers all in eight short lines. Or, take the explanation of the diversity of human speech—the whole story of the tower of Babel takes no more space than one little chapter of Herodotus. The origin of Israel's kindred neighbors and long-time enemies is told in similar compass in the story of Lot's daughters. One might go on with the origin of the tribes supposed to be descended from Keturah—four short verses, or the early history of Edom before any king reigned in Israel, requiring nine verses.

One of the most notable features of the early Hebrew historian's work is the way he holds to his central line and yet gets in many side lines bringing out origins and national connections in such brief fashion. In comparison and striking contrast Herodotus goes off into long digressions to show origins and relations of peoples. As we have seen, in the case of Egypt this takes a whole book and even in that of Scythia a large part of a book; yet he always does get back to his main theme at the point where he left it.

Both J. and Herodotus are supremely gifted as raconteurs and often seem in spirit epic poets quite as much as historians. It is many years indeed since I have read Homer's Catalogue of the Ships, yet as I read Herodotus's elaborate series of pictures of the national groups, their dress and equipment, that made up Xerxes' motley hordes, my mind inevitably reverts to the ships. In the thirty-nine chapters of this section of Herodotus, each bit by itself may be prosaic enough, but taken together they give a wonderfully colorful picture. The purpose of the whole elaborate review scene is to heighten the impression of the overwhelming forces that were about to sweep down over Greece; and surely the purpose is attained in a manner more characteristic of poetry than of prose history. This may serve as one example illustrative of the epic spirit of the writer who has been styled "the earliest great champion in the contest which established decisively the supremacy of prose in the Greek literature of the future." Prose in form, poetry it seems to me in the spirit of much of the content.

The epic quality of the early Hebrew narratives is widely recognized. The going forth of Abram, not knowing whither he went, and all his journeyings and adventures; the wanderings and vicissitudes of Jacob, of Joseph; the career of Moses; surely these are rightly styled epic cycles.

In their standard commentary on Herodotus, Messrs. How and Wells say: "He is the first to construct a long and elaborate narrative in which many parts are combined in due subordination and arrangement to make one great whole." Had they said he is the first to construct *such* a long and elaborate narrative, I might accept that part of their statement, though I might still have questioned their judgment as to "many parts being combined in due subordination." I find in the Judaean history, four or five centuries earlier, much greater skill in the construction of a narrative in which many parts are combined in due *subordination*, and certainly in the two series of JED histories telling the Hebrew story from Creation to the 6th century B. C., we find an elaborate narrative approaching in length the nine books of Herodotus, showing much greater success in combining many parts to make one great whole, with the subordinate parts really made subordinate.

What was Herodotus's theme? "What Herodotus the Halicarnassian has learnt by inquiry is here set forth: in order that so the memory of the past may not be blotted out from among men by time, and that great and marvelous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners, and especially the reason why they warred against each other, may not lack renown" (I § 1). I cannot imagine one of the Hebrew historians who had any large part in that wonderfully net narrative from Adam to Jehoiachin and Evil-Merodach setting out with similar purpose to memorialize the great and marvelous deeds done by Hebrews and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against one another and then devoting one ninth of his space, let us say to Babylonia and its conquest by Assyria before he could tell of Assyria's campaigns against Israel. Is not that parallel to what Herodotus does when he devotes one of his nine books to Egypt? The instance of Scythia is perhaps even more flagrant; the subject is so much less important and Herodotus's knowledge is so much less adequate.

When commentators speak of Herodotus as the first to do this or that, I fancy they would be forced to admit that they were thinking only of the literature of Europe and did not have Egypt or Asia within their thought at the time.

Like Herodotus, the Hebrew historians from the earliest onward put speech into the mouths of their characters. The commentators say: "To him (To Herodotus) is first due the custom which prevailed so long in history, both ancient and modern, of putting imaginary speeches into the mouths of real persons." "Such a method" they add, "was natural to a Greek trained on poetry." Such a method was equally natural to a Hebrew likewise trained on poetry. And such a statement as to the Greek writer's priority in the practice seems one of the most flagrant examples of ignoring all pre-Greek civilization as though it had never existed.

Comparing the words put into the mouths of their characters by Hebrew writers and by Herodotus, verisimilitude seems all on the side of the Hebrew historians. When the Greek has Persian officers debating political and military policies in the terms and concepts of Greek philosophy, it is not very convincing as a picture of what actually happened. My impression is, however, that the more we learn of the Palestinian environment, the more the speeches in Israel's histories seem in character. They seem to meet Thucydides's ideal for speeches in history—appropriateness.

I have spoken of the common interest in the origin of names, peoples, etc. of Herodotus and J., of their common practice of introducing speeches, and of the greater restraint and sense of proportion of the Hebrew historians. Possibly the latter comparison may not be quite fair to Herodotus; for I suppose we are comparing the work of one man who had few models with that which was a more or less prolonged communal development. Even that "first great historian" in Israel seems to have been a rather composite, multiple personality. Whether or not the comparison may be unfair to an individual, the facts are clear as to the precedence of Hebrew historiography and its skilfully proportioned construction.

In the books of Kings, composed in the century before Herodotus, one feels distinctly the work of a single master-mind shaping and composing materials from a number of sources with notable skill and considerable sense of proportion. I think there is nothing quite comparable in Herodotus to the skilful manner in which the Hebrew historian arranges the parallel histories for the two centuries of the Divided Kingdom. To me it seems that historical composition as a literary art had advanced further among the Hebrews in the 6th century B. C. than it had among the Greeks in Herodotus's time, a century later.

History as Science

Turning to the consideration of history as a science, we must take up a question of greater difficulty than the comparison of the literary art of Herodotus and the early Hebrew historians. Did Herodotus make a real advance beyond them as an historical investigator?

No Hebrew historian states the nature and purpose of his work as the Halicarnassian does in his opening paragraph. There we have two pregnant words, *ἱστορία* and *αἰτία*—investigation and cause. *Ἱστορία*, we know, had not yet acquired the specialized meaning of investigation of the past: it was not yet the name of a particular field of investigation. When Herodotus speaks of his own work, he calls it simply *λόγος* or *λόγοι*, which, I suppose, was practically equivalent to calling it prose. Herodotus's special field of investigation (*ἱστορία*) he defines as *τὰ γενόμενα, ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά*—the things that had happened, great and wondrous deeds, and especially, he adds, the *αἰτία*, the reason, why they warred. All this has a very modern sound. I think we do not know of anyone who had previously stated the historian's purpose like that; although the opening words of Hecataeus, when he says that he writes the things that seem to him to be true, etc., may suggest a similarly critical attitude. We lack means of testing this by Hecataeus's work. In the case of Herodotus we can judge from his long work how far he attained a critical attitude toward evidence and toward discovering the causes of events.

We can hardly expect to find evidence of formulation of a definite system of criteria for determining historical probability. He counts it his business to record the variant traditions that he has found. Sometimes he tells us which he prefers, but clear indications of the ground of his selection are lacking. In the famous passage VII 152, he definitely states his principle in reference to variant traditions: "For myself I thought it to be my business to set down that which is told me, to believe it is none at all of my business; let that saying hold good for the whole of my history; for indeed there is another tale current, etc." In this particular instance, he doesn't even indicate which of the traditions he prefers. In II 123, much the same principle is stated: "These Egyptian stories are for the use of whosoever believes such tales; for myself, it is my rule in this history that I record whatever is told me as I have heard it."

Evidently Herodotus's idea of investigation was not quite that of the modern scientific historian; still he had certain criteria:

(1) He tries to get the testimony of eye-witnesses; (2) He is a bit skeptical about marvels, unless they are ancient marvels. In so far as he adheres to these principles, he is good authority for the great events of 490 and 480, for many participants in Marathon

and Salamis were alive in his day. But they do not carry him far, when he essays to go back into earlier generations where reliance has to be placed on long tradition or written records. Here archaeological material of a certain sort is often appealed to; but much of this is not very convincing. The story that explains why a certain votive offering was placed at Delphi may contain a true tradition, or the object's presence may have given rise to the story. We should, however, credit Herodotus with a third criterion—the value of archaeological material.

When it comes to the question of his use of written sources, we find ourselves in the face of a pretty nearly blank wall. How far did he avail himself of records and how did he use them? We can tell very little about it! In three instances, it is thought that he makes use of Persian official documents: (1) The list of Satrapies (III 89—97); (2) The description of the Royal Road (V 52—53); (3) The Persian army list (VII 61—99). Beyond these, which must have come to him in translation, it seems that his sources were almost wholly oral. His language constantly suggests this.

If Herodotus was really the first to start out with such a purpose as that stated and to travel as far as he did in the investigation of the past, we may well concede his right to be called "The Father of History," even though his methods of research were rudimentary.

In reference to the other purpose of historical investigation which he proposes to himself—to discover the causes of great movements such as wars, it is recognized that Herodotus had but little conception of the larger forces operative in great historical movements; he confuses immediate occasion with ultimate cause. But here again, if he was the first to set himself deliberately to find and record the causes of wars, he should be given all praise.

We must, however, raise the question whether he was really the first to set himself to the undertaking he so well describes. To answer it, we must turn to the earlier Hebrew historians. In seeking to make this comparison, we are confronted at once with a difficulty due to a fundamental difference between ancient Greek and Hebrew writers. Greek writers start out as self-conscious authors; the ancient Hebrew historians started immediately with the subject about which they were writing. "In the beginning God created," or Exodus, "Now these are the names of the sons of Israel who came into Egypt," and so on through all the historical books until we come to Herodotus's contemporary, Nehemiah, where we find the heading: "The words of Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah. Now it came to pass in the month of Chislev, in the twentieth year, as I was in Shushan the palace." But never, even then, does one of our Hebrew writers start by telling us the how and why of his book. This holds good even into New Testament times. When Luke begins with himself as investigator and recorder, that personal preface is of itself sufficient to indicate that he had had Greek training.

Now my question is: Were the ancient Hebrew narrators because they did not state that they had inquired and that their purpose was to preserve the memory of great and marvelous deeds and especially the reason why peoples acted as they did, were they any less true investigators and recorders of historical knowledge—genuine historians?

They do not, like Herodotus, express doubts as to the authenticity of that which they consider it their function to record. In the process of compilation, they sometimes set down what the modern critic regards as variant traditions of the same matter, but without comment. This practice may indeed raise some doubt as to whether they had any critical consciousness of variant testimonies from the past. On the other hand, the whole course of the development of ancient Hebrew historiography shows a gradual building up on the basis of earlier prose records for which evidence is so lacking in Herodotus.

The earliest recorders known to us may have had no written sources other than such books of poems as "The Wars of Jehovah" and "The Book of Jashar," just as Herodotus had Hesiod and Homer (II 53), but, before one goes far in tracing the course of Hebrew historical writing, the evidence of use of earlier documents grows until, in the 6th century, one finds the writer of Kings working with many distinct documents and these of notable authenticity.

In the matter of showing the reasons of events, the Hebrew historians do not suffer by comparison although, here too, they do not do it in an obvious, self-conscious way. Take that wonderful early story of David's court and family life now embodied in II Samuel 9—20, I Kings 1—3, which shows so clearly how Absalom's rebellion came about and how it came about that Solomon inherited the throne instead of one of David's older sons—the writer does not say: "Go to now, I will show the reasons why," but he shows them. The same can be said about the narratives of I Samuel that tell us how Saul became King and how the sovereignty passed from his line to that of David. When Assyria and Babylonia come into the picture in their western conquests, we do not see the great movements shaped so often by petty personal spites such as Herodotus frequently assigns as the reason why the Greek states are found at the mercy of their enemies. The hyper-development of Greek individualism may suggest the truth of some of these instances, but one wonders whether these personal spites could have played so frequent and large a part as Herodotus thinks. In fact, failure to appreciate the real causes of events has been called "the most serious charge" against his work.

Of course, both Herodotus and the Hebrew historians assume a knowledge of the ways of the unseen powers to which a modern historian would not lay claim. With the Greek, there is that terrible sense of Fate, so familiar in the great tragedies. and the sense, too, that human self-exaltation must receive divine rebuke. There is also. a constant emphasis upon the idea that the oracle has declared it in advance, therefore, it must happen; this is perhaps scarcely distinguishable from the idea of Fate. With the early Hebrew historians, reckoned by the Hebrews themselves among the prophets, the growing prophetic idea of God as the just ruler in human affairs gives an interpretation of history that seems more rational, at least to modern Christian and Jewish thought.

In the matter of factual accuracy, as far as the main theme of his history is concerned, Herodotus has the advantage over most of the Hebrew historians in dealing with events close enough at hand to enable him, we have noted, to obtain information directly from eye-witnesses. On the other hand, for the history of the Hebrew monarchy, from the rise of David to the Babylonian exile, the Hebrew historians had the advantage of records, often it seems contemporary or nearly so.

We have the means of testing the historical accuracy of much in the Hebrew records of this period of the monarchy by the Egyptian and especially the Assyrian and Babylonian contemporary accounts as well as in the fruits of excavation. Unfortunately much polemic use has been made of the evidence, as by selecting confirmatory parts and explaining away discrepancies; but out of all the welter, it is possible to discover the relative accuracy of the Hebrew records of the facts, at least from David on.

Herodotus, it would seem, had no such reliable knowledge for any period of comparable length. Even for the great events in the midst of which he was born, his questionable statements are at least as numerous as those for the far longer sweep of Hebrew national history. Judged by results then, rather than by professions, the Hebrew historians reached at least as great success in the investigation and intelligent explanation of facts as Herodotus and did this at an earlier date.

To the Greek, surely we must give recognition as the first, of whom we know, who formulated these great aims of history: investigation of the facts of the past and explanation of their cause. Does this make him the Father of History, or does that high title belong to those who had earlier done the things at which he was consciously aiming?

For myself, even an inadequate comparison of the work of Herodotus and the early Hebrew historians has helped, as suggested at the outset, to a little more intelligent understanding of the work of the great men of Israel who produced the first genuine historical literature and, at the same time, has given a better appreciation of the genius exhibited in Herodotus's almost single-handed achievement.

ZUM VERSTÄNDNIS DES ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN OPFERGEDANKENS[1]

ALFRED BERTHOLET
UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN

WENN ich versuchen möchte, einige Bemerkungen zum Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Opfergedankens zu äußern, so bin ich mir wohl bewußt, ein Thema gewählt zu haben, das schon so außerordentlich viel verhandelt worden ist, daß wesentlich Neues darüber zu sagen kaum möglich erscheinen dürfte. Ich will mir denn auch das Ziel nicht höher stecken, als nur einen Gesichtspunkt hervorzukehren, der in der bisherigen Betrachtung, wenn auch nicht immer außer Acht gelassen, vielleicht doch nicht genügend berücksichtigt worden ist. Damit deute ich bereits an, und darauf möchte ich sogar größtes Gewicht legen, daß nichts mehr verfehlt wäre, als das alttestamentliche Opfer nur aus einem einzigen Gesichtspunkt heraus betrachten und verstehen zu wollen[2].

In der Tat ist die Zeit längst vorüber, wo man die landläufige Anschauung, als sei das Opfer nichts anderes als eine *Gabe* an die Gottheit, auf die Betrachtung der alttestamentlichen Opfervorstellungen meinte anwenden zu müssen. Gewiß ist es das auch nach alttestamentlicher Auffassung in einer Fülle von Fällen gewesen. zumal in der Zeit, da Israel, zum ansässigen Bauernvolk geworden. an fröhlichen Erntefesten seinem Gott in der Darbietung von Produkten seines Ackerbaus wie seiner Viehzucht den Tribut seiner Dankbarkeit glaubte zollen zu können, und schon die Bezeichnung des Opfers als *mincha* — eine Übertragung aus der Profansprache, in der das Wort die einem menschlichen Großen dargebrachte freiwillige oder erzwungene Gabe bezeichnet —, spricht laut genug für solche Auffassung. Aber schon der Tatsache der üblichen Opfermahlzeiten gegenüber versagt sie, und es bleibt vor allem R. Smiths[3] Verdienst, für den *communio*-Charakter eines guten Teils des alttestamentlichen wie des menschlichen Opfers überhaupt das Verständnis erschlossen zu haben. Dieses Verdienst wird ihm nicht geschmälert, wenn wir heute finden, daß er in der Durchführung seiner These mannigfach über das Ziel hinausgeschossen habe. Das tun zu dürfen ist ja Privileg desjenigen, der einen neuen und fundamentalen Gedanken zu durchschlagender Wirkung zu bringen sich bemüht. Daß in Wahrheit R. Smith das Recht der Gabentheorie zur Erklärung des alttestamentlichen Opfers viel zu stark zurücktreten läßt, hat namentlich George Buchanan Gray[4] mit viel Gelehrsamkeit nachgewiesen. Ich brauche dem nicht weiter nachzugehen. Nur an einem Beispiel möchte ich zeigen, wie ungebührlich der *communio*-Gedanke von R. Smith gelegentlich überspannt wird, weil dieses Beispiel uns weiter zu führen vermag.

---

[1] Vortrag, gehalten am 13. Juni 1930 in der Alttestamentlichen Sektion des Wiener Orientalistentages.

[2] Einen erfreulichen Fortschritt in dieser Hinsicht bezeichnet das Buch von Adolf Wendel: *Das Opfer in der altisraelitischen Religion*, Leipzig 1927.

Es handelt sich um den Versuch, das Sündopfer im Priesterkodex vom Gesichtspunkt des *communio*-Gedankens aus zu verstehen. Es soll, meint R. Smith[5], wie die übrigen Formen des Sühnopfers, bei denen kein Opfermahl stattfindet, an dem der Opfernde selber teilnimmt, in gerader Linie aus dem alten Ritual der im Opfer dargestellten Gemeinschaft zwischen den Verehrern und ihrem Gott entwickelt sein und im Grunde auf demselben Prinzip beruhen wie die gewöhnlichen Opfer, bei denen das Opfermahl einen Hauptteil ausmacht. Diesen Satz wagt R. Smith u. a. im Blick auf die Vorschrift Lev 6 19, wonach das Sündopfer von den männlichen Priestern verzehrt werden soll: In der Tat also auch hier ein Essen des Opfers menschlicherseits, freilich mit strikter Beschränkung auf die Priesterschaft und zwar nur die männliche. Diese Beschränkung wird damit motiviert, daß Sündopferfleisch „hochheilig“ (קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים) sei; der Laie aber ist von jedem Kontakt mit Hochheiligem fernzuhalten, weil er selber nicht die Heiligkeit besitzt, die ihn Hochheiligem gegenüber immun machen würde und eine derartige Unterbilanz an Heiligkeit gefährlich, ja lebensgefährlich werden kann[6]. Entsprechend denn auch die Vorschrift, daß wenn etwas vom Blut des Sündopfers ans Kleid eines Laien spritzt, das von ihm Bespritzte an heiliger Stätte gewaschen werden muß. Ein irdenes Gefäß, in dem es gekocht wurde, muß zerbrochen werden; wurde es aber in einem kupfernen Gefäße gekocht, so muß dieses gescheuert und gehörig ausgespült werden[7].

---

[3] *Die Religion der Semiten*, deutsch von R. Stübe, Freiburg i. B. 1899, S. 270. Dritte englische Ausgabe, durch Stanley A. Cook, London 1927.

[4] *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, Oxford 1925.

[5] A. a. O., S. 270.

Dies letztere führt uns schon auf die Spur, daß hier offenbar ganz andere Gedanken im Spiele sind als die einer *communio*, die zwischen Gott und Menschen (im besondern Fall priesterlichen Menschen) gestiftet würde. Tatsächlich gibt auch Lev 10, 17 den Sinn dieses priesterlichen Essens unmißverständlich anders an: nicht um den Priestern so etwas wie die Wohltat einer Gottesgemeinschaft zu verschaffen, ist es ihnen zugewiesen, sondern „um die Verschuldung der Gemeinde wegzubringen und ihr Sühne vor Jahve zu erwirken“. Ja, der Priesterkodex kennt Fälle, wo ein Essen des Sündopfers durch die Priester überhaupt unzulässig wird: das sind diejenigen, wo es für ein Vergehen, dessen sich Hoherpriester oder Gesamtgemeinde schuldig gemacht haben, dargebracht wird. Da ist das Fleisch des Tieres, das diesem Zwecke dient, außerhalb des Lagers zu verbrennen[8]. So gänzlich ist hier auch der letzte Rest des Gedankens einer *communio* zwischen Gott und menschlichen Opferdarbringern, zu dem R. Smith noch die Beziehung suchte, ausgeschaltet. Dann kann aber auch in den Fällen, wo die Priester vom Sündopferfleisch essen durften, dieses Essen nicht, wie R. Smith wollte, einen *wesentlichen* Teil des ganzen Zeremoniells ausgemacht haben, vielmehr war es nur Mittel, sich des Sündopferfleisches in einer für die Gemeinde ungefährlichen Form zu entledigen. Zu diesem Zweck standen ja wohl überhaupt nur zwei Möglichkeiten zur Verfügung: die eine, radikalere, war eben die Verbrennung des Sündopferfleisches, und es wäre sogar denkbar, daß sie die ältere und ursprüngliche Praxis darstellte; die andere bestand darin, daß Personen, die gegen seine Gefahren immun waren, es verzehrten, und diese zweite hatte den Vorteil, daß priesterliches Interesse damit zugleich auf seine Rechnung kam, so daß solche Praxis möglicherweise überhaupt erst mit der Ausweitung priesterlicher Vorrechte aufkam. Es gälte in diesem Falle, was Ludwig Deubner einmal in ganz anderm Zusammenhang[9] gesagt hat, es sei eine bekannte Erscheinung, daß wo eine heilige Handlung vollzogen wird, das Bestreben zutage trete, die freiwerdenden zauberischen Kräfte persönlichen Zwecken dienstbar zu machen.

---

[6] Vgl. II Sam 6 6f.

[7] Lev 6 20f.

[8] Lev 4 12. 21, vgl. 6 23.

Ist das Bisherige richtig, so lag das Wesentliche des ganzen Sündopferbrauches in anderm als im priesterlichen Essen, es bestand 1. in einer besondern Blutmanipulation, 2. in der Verbrennung gewisser Fettstücke des Opfertieres auf dem Altar[10]. Aber stehen wir mit letzterm nicht einfach wieder auf dem Boden des Gedankens einer Gabe an die Gottheit? Das Fett würde ihr als besonders wertvoller Teil des Opfertieres zur Nahrung geschenkt und zwar in der einer geistigeren Fassung der Gottheit entsprechenden Form der Entmaterialisierung, wie sie gerade durch die Verbrennung erreicht wird. Von hier aus könnte es dann naheliegen, auch die Blutmanipulation dahin zu deuten, daß der Gottheit Blut dargebracht werden sollte als das Kostbarste, was der Mensch ihr überhaupt zu geben hat, Blut wo möglich als Ersatz des Lebens selber, das nach alttestamentlicher Auffassung im Blut bekanntlich seinen Sitz hat[11]. Dabei ließe sich nur die Frage nicht ganz unterdrücken, was ihr das Blut eigentlich sollte. Der Psalmist[12], der in etwas massiver Argumentation Gott sprechen läßt: „Trinke ich etwa das Blut von Böcken?“ hat immerhin richtig empfunden, daß Blut als Gabe an die Gottheit diese im Grunde als blutdürstige voraussetzen würde. Ehe man sich zu einer derartigen Annahme entschließt, wird man sich die Blutmanipulation beim Sündopfer genauer anzusehen und sich zu fragen haben, wo und in welcher Bedeutung entsprechende Manipulationen sonst wiederkehren.

---

[9] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* XIII (1910), S. 492.

[10] Ex 29 12ff.

[11] Lev 17 14.

[12] Ps. 50 13.

Die Manipulation selber ist eine doppelte: „Nimm etwas von dem Blut des Farren und streiche es mit deinem Finger an die Hörner des Altars, alles übrige Blut aber gieße am Altar auf den Boden“[13]; offenbar fällt das Hauptgewicht auf die *Blutbestreichung* an die Hörner des Altars[14]. Was wissen wir von sonstiger Blutbestreichung? Das bekannteste Beispiel liefert natürlich die Passahvorschrift[15], wonach man Oberschwelle und Türpfosten der Häuser mit dem Blut der Passahlämmer zu bestreichen hat, und hier ist der Sinn deutlich ein apotropäischer: es gilt der drohenden Pest zu begegnen. Das Blut hat nämlich die geheimnisvolle Kraft, sie abzuwehren. So bestrichen die vorislamischen Araber und bestreichen nach Doughtys[16] Angabe noch die heutigen ihr Vieh mit Blut, um es gegen schädigende Einflüsse zu schützen[17], und am Heiligtum zu Harbuscha ließ sich Curtiss[18] als muhammedanischen und christlichen Brauch von einer alten Frau berichten, mit dem Blut bestreiche man Knaben die Stirn, zuweilen auch die gesamte Türeinfassung, dann werde es den Knaben wohlgehen. Nach babylonischem Heilritus war Bestreichung eines kranken Auges mit Skorpionenblut von unmittelbarer Heilwirkung[19]. Wir stehen damit einfach auf dem Boden des allbekannten Glaubens an automatische Kraftwirkung des Blutes. Schon die Dajaks auf Borneo reiben ihre

---

[13] Ex 29 12.

[14] Vgl. Hes 43 20.

[15] Ex 12 22.

[16] *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, Cambridge 1888, I, S. 499.

[17] G. Jacob, *Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament*, S. 8.

[18] *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*, Leipzig 1903, S. 218.

[19] Vgl. A. Lods, Les idées des Israélites sur la maladie, *Marti-Festschrift* (*ZAW*, Beiheft 41), 1925, S. 190f.

Waffen mit Blut ein, um sie kräftiger zu machen[20]. Nach Herodot[21] wird in Arabien ein Bündnis eidlich bekräftigt, indem sieben Steine mit Blut bestrichen werden. Bekanntlich sucht man beim Eid möglichst starke Kraftträger, um durch solidarische Verbindung mit ihnen den Kraftgehalt einer feierlichen Aussage zu steigern[22]. Entsprechend kann in andern Fällen der eigene Leib der den Eid Beschwörenden durch besondere Kraftzufuhr gestärkt werden: so geschah es bei den Slaven, die sich mit dem Blut des Opfertieres beschmierten, um dem Treueid größere Festigkeit zu leihen[23]. Im Effekt kommt es auf dasselbe hinaus, wenn diese Stärkung des Körpers dadurch erzielt wird, daß ihm besonders krafthaltige Nahrung zugeführt wird. So verstehe ich den Salzbund; denn Salz gilt dank seiner Schärfe als besonderer Kraftträger, wie es denn z. B. heute noch Araber als Abwehrmittel gegen den bösen Blick verwenden[24].

Kehren wir nach einem Blick auf das dargebotene Material, das sich natürlich unschwer verdoppeln ließe, zu den Blutmanipulationen im alttestamentlichen Gesetz zurück, so dürfte bereits zur Wahrscheinlichkeit gebracht sein, daß sie weder vom Gesichtspunkt der Gaben- noch der *communio*-Theorie des Opfers aus zu begreifen sind. Von Blutbestreichung an die Hörner des Altars ist wiederholt die Rede, sei es an den Räucheraltar: so beim Sündopfer des Hohenpriesters[25] oder der Gemeinde[26], sei es an den Brandopferaltar: so beim Sündopfer des Fürsten[27] oder eines gewöhnlichen Israeliten[28]. Außerdem kommt Blutbestreichung vor an Ohrläppchen, rechten Daumen und rechte große Zehe Aarons und seiner Söhne bei ihrer Priesterweihe[29], und an dieselben Körperteile des Aussätzigen am achten Tage seiner Reinigung[30]. Diese beiden letzten Fälle sind besonders lehrreich; denn hier ist die Bedeutung der Zeremonie unverkennbar: was sie im einen wie im andern Falle bezweckt, ist offenbar unmittelbare Kraftwirkung, nur gewissermaßen mit entgegengesetzten Vorzeichen, einmal positiv im Sinne der Weihung oder Heiligung als sozusagen direkter Kraftladung, das andere Mal im negativen Sinn der Reinigung als einer Beseitigung kontagiösen Krankheitsstoffes. Nur daß diese Aufteilung in positiv und negativ, die wir im Interesse wissenschaftlicher Klarheit vielleicht glauben vornehmen zu können, genauer besehen nichts als nachträgliche künstliche Zerfällung von etwas ist, was nach primitiver Auffassung einfach ineinander liegt, wie denn auch Reinigung und Weihung oder Heiligung unmittelbar ineinander übergehen. Dürfen wir hoffen, uns von hier aus das Verständnis der Blutapplikation an die Hörner des Altars zu erschließen, so läge ihr ursprünglicher und eigentlichster Sinn im Bestreben, dem Altar selber neue Kraft zuzuführen, um ihm an Heiligkeitsstoff zu ersetzen, was ihm durch die Sünden des Hohenpriesters, der Gemeinde, des Fürsten oder auch nur des einzelnen, die doch alle mit ihm in einem gewissen Rapport der Solidarität stehen, entzogen worden ist. Und dabei wiegen die Sünden der Gesamtgemeinde oder des Hohenpriesters als ihres Exponenten sozusagen schwerer als die des Fürsten, der schon mehr der weltlichen Sphäre zugerechnet wird, oder des einzelnen Israeliten; daher in den beiden ersten Fällen die Blutapplikation an die Hörner des Räucheraltars, in den beiden letzten an diejenigen des Brandopferaltars; denn jener ist dank seiner Stellung innerhalb des Offenbarungszeltes oder Tempelhauses seinem Allerheiligsten näher als dieser, der außerhalb steht, und bekanntlich baut sich der gesamte Kult des Priesterkodex auf ein streng durchgeführtes Prinzip zu- und abnehmender Heiligkeit oder anders ausgedrückt: Kraftgeladenheit auf.

---

[20] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* XVI (1913), S. 209.

[21] III, 8.

[22] Vgl. meinen Artikel „Eid“ in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* II, Sp. 49ff. Über Verwendung des Blutes beim Eid s. noch Johs. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, Straßburg 1914, S. 148. J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin 1897, S. 128.

[23] Bertholet-Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (Chantepie de la Saussaye⁴), Tübingen 1925, II, S. 531.

[24] A. Jirku, *Materialien zur Volksreligion Israels*, Leipzig 1914, S. 17 A 2. Vgl. M. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Gießen 1905, I, S. 379.

[25] Lev 4 7.

[26] Lev 4 18

[27] Lev 4 25.

---

[28] Lev 4 30. 34.

[29] Ex 29 20, Lev 8 23f.

[30] Lev 14 14.

Dieselbe Kraftwirkung wie die Blutbestreichung kann natürlich *Blutbesprengung* haben. Sie findet sich z. B. in Verbindung mit der vor einem Augenblick erwähnten Priesterweihe, indem das Blut, das nicht an die zu Weihenden appliziert wird, ringsum an den Altar zu sprengen ist[31]. Vor allem aber ist der Ritus des Versöhnungsfestes zu nennen[32], wo der Hohepriester etwas von dem Blute seines Sündopferfarrens und dem Blute des Sündopferbockes des Volkes an die Deckplatte der Lade und siebenmal vor sie hinsprengt[33], darauf vom selben Blut an die Hörner des Altars streicht und wieder siebenmal auf ihn sprengt, um ihn von den Unreinigkeiten der Israeliten zu reinigen. Der Blutritus hat also wiederum unmittelbar sündentilgende Kraft, und es ließen sich auch hier analoge Bräuche aus ganz andern Gebieten anführen, so wenn Eingeborene Borneos begangene Sünden dadurch glauben beseitigen zu können, daß sie die Türen ihrer Häuser mit dem Blut eines geopferten Schweines besprengen, oder wenn im Ritual der Magna Mater der Myste durch die Taufe mit dem Blut des geschlachteten Stieres von Sünden befreit wird. Zu dem, was Blut hier in negativem Sinne bewirkt, ließe sich als positives Gegenstück ein Brauch hinstellen, bei dem man schwanken kann, inwieweit man ihn unter den Gesichtspunkt eines Opfers rücken will: ich meine die auch aus dem Alten Testament uns bekannte Trauersitte, sich angesichts eines Toten blutig zu ritzen. Ihr ursprünglicher Sinn nämlich dürfte wohl der dynamistische gewesen sein, daß dem Leichnam durch das auf ihn herabfließende Blut neue pulsierende Lebensenergie zugeführt werden sollte[34].

---

[31] Ex 29 $_{20}$, Lev 8 $_{24}$. Vgl. auch den Ritus der Tempelreinigung, Hes 45 $_{18}$ff. In einen entsprechenden Zusammenhang gehört auch das verwickelte Ritual Num 19 $_{1}$ff.

[32] Lev 16.

[33] Das ist Steigerung des beim Sündopfer des Hohenpriesters und der Gemeinde vorgeschriebenen Ritus, Opferblut nur vor den Vorhang des Heiligtums hinzusprengen, Lev 4 $_{6, 17}$.

[34] Vgl. zu dieser Auffassung Fr. von Duhn, „Rot und tot" im *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, IX (1906), S. 1—24.

Mit dem Blut wechselt das *Öl.* So begnügt sich zur Reinigung des Aussätzigen der Priester nicht mit der besprochenen Blutbestreichung, er gießt sich etwas von dem vom Geheilten dargebrachten Öl in die linke Hand, taucht seinen rechten Finger hinein, sprengt davon siebenmal vor Jahve und streicht von dem übrigen etwas an das rechte Ohrläppchen, den rechten Daumen und die rechte große Zehe des Patienten über das Blut des Schuldopfers; den Rest des Öls bringt er ihm aufs Haupt[35]. Offenbar läuft die beabsichtigte Wirkung mit der des Blutes parallel: wir stoßen nur auf das, was ich anderswo eine Gemination der Kultriten genannt habe[36], und entstanden wird sie sein aus Überlagerung von Bräuchen verschiedener Kulturen: während das Blut als Kultmittel bis in die Nomadenzeit zurückreicht, weist das Öl als typisches Produkt des Kulturlandes in die Zeit, wo man darin ansässig geworden ist. Hier aber gilt es dann nicht minder als das Blut als entschiedener Kraftträger, wie schon aus seiner Verwendung bei der Salbung, die doch wohl als Kraftmitteilung zu verstehen ist, ersichtlich werden mag[37]. Man wird also auch die Ölapplikation an den heiligen Stein, die wir aus der bekannten Geschichte Jakobs als den zu Bethel üblichen Ritus kennenlernen[38], nicht anders als die einstige Blutapplikation an ihn, im Sinne einer Kraftzufuhr an das heilige Objekt begreifen dürfen. Man muß nur sehen, was *im übrigen* als eigentliche Opfermaterie erscheint.

Ich gehe aus von dem, was bei Heils- und Sündopfer für Jahve verbrannt wird: das Fett, das die Eingeweide bedeckt... dazu die beiden Nieren samt dem Fett an ihnen und der Lappen an der Leber[39]. Hier sind charakteristischerweise gerade drei Dinge genannt: Fett, Niere, Leber, die als besonders krafthaltig galten. Mit Fett salbte man z. B. die Waffen, um ihnen größere Wirkungskraft zu verleihen[40], die Niere wurde wohl von der Voraussetzung ihres Zusammenhanges mit den Zeugungsorganen aus als Ausgangspunkt der Lebenskraft angesehen, und wie mit ihr in dieser Hinsicht die Leber wechselt, habe ich bereits in meinem Hamburger Vortrag, in dem ich über das Dynamistische im Alten Testament überhaupt sprach, ausgeführt[41]. Also darf die Darbringung gerade dieser Teile an die Gottheit wohl füglich unter den Gesichtspunkt einer Kraftzufuhr an sie gestellt werden. Von ihm aus ließe sich auch ohne weiteres die Forderung der Fehllosigkeit des Opfertieres und die Bevorzugung männlicher Tiere verstehen. Ich weiß sogar nicht, ob es zu gewagt wäre, aus solchen Zusammenhängen heraus für die viel umstrittene Deutung der *'Azkara* (so heißt der Teil des Speisopfers, der verbrannt wird) an eine Ableitung von *zakar* = männlich zu denken. Auch daß das Opfertier noch zu keiner Profanarbeit verwendet worden sein darf[42], könnte in der Konsequenz des besprochenen Gedankens liegen; denn gerade wo Heiligkeit im wesentlichen als Kraftgeladenheit betrachtet wird, bedeutet jeder Profangebrauch einen entsprechenden Kraftabzug. Unter dem Gesichtspunkt einer Kraftzufuhr könnte leicht auch die Zugabe des Salzes begriffen werden, das wir als besondern Kraftträger bereits zu nennen hatten. Nach ausdrücklicher Gesetzesvorschrift darf es beim Speisopfer nie fehlen[43], und Hesekiel fordert es auch für das Brandopfer[44].

---

[35] Lev 14 15ff.

[36] Vgl. meine Abhandlung „Über Gemination von Kultriten“, *Reinhold-Seeberg-Festschrift*, Leipzig 1929, II, S. 151ff.

[37] Darin läge die Beantwortung einer von Wellhausen (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* VII, 1904, S. 39) noch offengelassenen Frage.

[38] Gen 28 18.

[39] Ex 29 13, 22; Lev 3 3, 9; 4 8.

Bei Anlaß des Opfers in Samuels Heimatstadt[45] erfahren wir, daß Voraussetzung seines Vollzugs die Segnung durch den Gottesmann ist. Wiederum ist der Segen, die *berākhā*, eine Kraftladung. Wie sehr die berākhā als krafthaltig gilt, läßt sich noch besonders deutlich am islamischen Heiligenkult der Gegenwart beobachten. Daß endlich auch dem Räucherwerk ursprünglich besondere Kraftwirkung zugeschrieben wird, weiß man schon aus gewissen Lustrationsbräuchen. Aus den Psalmen ist bekannt, wie mit der Vergeistigung der Vorstellungen als bester Teil des Opfers der Lobpreis Gottes erscheint. Dabei ist nun aber lehrreich, auf den Ausdruck zu achten, mit dem dieser Lobpreis bezeichnet wird: was da Gott darzubringen oder zu geben ist, heißt *'oz*[46], und das bedeutet im Grunde nichts anderes als Macht und Kraft. Für den Dichter des 8. Psalmes ist schon der „*'oz*" aus Kindermund eine Macht, so stark[47], daß sie Feind und Widersacher zum Schweigen zu bringen vermag. Nur beiläufig bemerke ich, daß, wie die Geschichte des Priestertums uns lehrt, mancherorts vorzugsweise Kinder mit priesterlichen Aufgaben betraut wurden, offenbar aus dem Gedanken heraus, daß sie dank ihrer Unverbrauchtheit die wirksamsten Kraftvermittler seien.

---

[40] Vgl. II Sam 1 21.

[41] Das *Dynamistische im Alten Testament*, Tübingen 1926, S. 11ff. Vgl. noch M. Jastrow, The Liver as the Seat of the Soul, *Studies in the History of Religion presented to Toy*, 1912, S. 143—168.

[42] Num. 19 2; Deut. 21 3f.; vgl. 15 19.

[43] Lev 2 13.

[44] Hes. 43 24.

[45] I Sam 9 13. Vgl. den islamischen Brauch der *berākhā* (I. Goldziher-Fr. Babinger. *Vorlesungen über den Islam*^{2}, 1925, S. 60).

Nach dem Gesagten ist es also immer wieder *Kraftstoff*, der, wenn auch im zuletzt genannten Fall sozusagen nur bildlich, auf den Altar kommt, so daß dieser selber als Kraftträger erscheint. Von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus dürfte auch die Bedeutung seiner *Hörner* als typischer Kraftsymbole in einem vielleicht noch kaum gewürdigten Sinn zu verstehen sein. Zur Bezeichnung seiner Einweihung verwendet Hesekiel einmal den merkwürdigen Ausdruck, der sonst bei der Priesterweihe üblich ist: *millē jad* = die Hand füllen[48]. Als Objekt dieser Handfüllung hat man Geld oder das Amt oder das Opfer ergänzt. Wenn es richtig ist, dies letztere im besprochenen Sinn des Krafthaltigen zu verstehen, so könnte das seine Eignung als das hier vorauszusetzende Objekt steigern, und die Anwendung des Ausdrucks auf den Altar verlöre von ihrer Auffälligkeit: er wird geweiht, indem er einfach mit Kraft begabt wird.

Mit Kraft einmal begabt, bedarf er infolge des Vielen, was sie ihm rauben kann, sozusagen ständiger Kraftnachfüllung, und gerade diesem Zweck dienen die sich stets wiederholenden Opfer. Daß er aber überhaupt mit Kraft geladen sein muß, begreift sich aus seiner ganzen Entstehung und Bedeutung: Entwickelt hat er sich, wenigstens auf semitischem Boden, aus dem heiligen Stein. Der Stein aber ist gewissermaßen die Leiblichkeit der Gottheit[49], und was dem sinnlichen Substrat widerfährt, widerfährt dem Numen selber. Kraftzufuhr an den Altar bedeutet Kraftzufuhr an das Numen, und dieses bedarf ihrer, um selber wirkungskräftig zu werden[50]. Das wird z. B. auch der Sinn sein, wenn der Inder das Gesicht seiner Götter mit roter Farbe, dem bekannten Blutersatz, beschmiert. Wenn ihn darob der berühmte Bhaktisänger Tukārām als Toren und Schuldbeladenen schilt[51], so ist das nur Ausdruck seiner überlegenen Aufgeklärtheit. *Das Numen selber der Stärkung bedürftig*: an diesem Punkt eröffnet sich uns die Perspektive auf einen ganz großen religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang. Es ist bekannt, daß Primitive ihre Fetische mit Blut, vielleicht auch mit Fett einzureiben pflegen, und die Absicht, die solchem Brauch zugrunde liegt, ist offenbar, ihnen dadurch Kraftstoff zuzuführen. Die Kpelle in Liberia nennen das „den Zauber füttern“[52]. Als ich kürzlich in Pariser und Londoner Museen religionsgeschichtlichen Objekten nachging, war mir wieder besonders eindrücklich der Anblick gewisser hölzerner Fetische, z. B. aus dem belgischen Kongo, die Löcher aufweisen, welche dem Zwecke dienen, magische Substanz aufzunehmen; ohne sie wären sie nicht wirkungskräftig, und es ist interessant zu sehen, wie diese Substanz gelegentlich so sehr als das Wesentliche erscheint, daß es, wie uns Ankermann belehrt[53], für unsere Museen verhältnismäßig leicht ist, sogenannte Fetischfiguren zu erwerben, während der Eingeborene die Zaubermedizin selbst niemals freiwillig hergäbe. Zwischen jener Zaubermedizin und dem Blut, Öl oder was immer an das das Numen bergende oder ihm geweihte Heiligtum gebracht wird, muß ein entwicklungsgeschichtlicher Zusammenhang bestehen, und darin sehe ich es begründet, daß man dem Verständnis des Opfers ohne *Berücksichtigung des dynamistischen Gesichtspunktes* nie wird ganz gerecht werden können.

---

[46] Ps 29 1, 68 35.

[47] v. 3.

[48] 43 26.

---

[49] Vgl. B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, I, Tübingen 1905, S. 118.

[50] Vgl. z. B. eine entsprechende Auffassung in bezug auf den moabitischen Gott Kamos bei Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* III, Tübingen 1923, S. 148.

[51] Den entsprechenden Text bietet F. O. Schrader in A. Bertholet: *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, Der Hinduismus (im Erscheinen).

[52] Bertholet-Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (Chantepie de la Saussaye[4]) I, S. 183.

[53] Ebenda, S. 161.

Diese Erkenntnis erfährt sofort eine Bestätigung, wenn man beachtet, daß, wer mit dem Opfer als dem mit Kraftstoff Erfüllten umzugehen hat, selber, um ihn nicht in seiner Wirkung zu neutralisieren oder gar durch ihn geschädigt zu werden, mit besondern Kräften ausgerüstet sein muß. Kein Wunder, wenn Könige ohne weiteres opfern dürfen; sind sie doch von Natur oder durch ihre Stellung „Manamenschen“. Der Laie sucht Stärkung, indem er sich zum Kult schmückt[54], denn Schmuck ist von Haus aus Amulett und als solches magischer Kraftträger. Auch schon die Enthaltung von Weibern vor dem Kultakt ließe sich als Meidung einer Schwächung begreifen[55]. Vielleicht könnte man sogar auf die Vermutung kommen, die viel verhandelte *semîkāh*[56], d. h. der Brauch, dem Opfertier die Hand aufzulegen, sei aus dem Zusammenhang entsprechender Gedanken zu begreifen[57]. Für den alten Inder wenigstens gilt, daß wenn ein Tier geopfert wird, durch Berührung die geweihte Potenz desselben in den Opferer übergeleitet wird[58]. Auf semitischem Boden finde ich einen ähnlichen Gedanken in dem zu El Ela geübten Brauch, einen Kranken dadurch zu heilen, daß das Opfertier vor seiner Schlachtung um ihn herumgetrieben wird[59].

Dieses letzte Beispiel führt uns ganz von selber noch darauf, einiges Detail im Opferritual im Licht dynamistischer Vorstellungen uns verständlicher zu machen. Gerade der Umlauf um den Altar gehört in den Bereich des sogenannten magischen Kreises[60], durch dessen Vollzug Kräfte entweder zentrifugal vom zentralen Kraftherd (in diesem Fall dem Altar) auf die ihn Umwandelnden oder umgekehrt zentripetal von den ihn Umwandelnden auf den Altar übergeleitet werden. Ähnlich verhält es sich mit dem Hindurchschreiten zwischen den Opferstücken[61]: Kraft strömt aus ihnen auf die Hindurchschreitenden aus[62], und solcher Kraft bedürfen besonders wiederum die Kontrahenten eines Vertrages — darum begegnet uns gerade in solchem Zusammenhang diese Zeremonie —; denn der Vertrag verlangt, nicht anders als der Eid, von dem wir es schon erwähnten, besondere Festigkeit. In allen Fällen steht der heilige Bezirk, in dem sich die Opferhandlung vollzieht, sozusagen unter Hochspannung von Kraft. Daher bei den Griechen das Verbot der sogenannten *ἐκφορά*, des Hinaustragens des Opferfleisches[63], zu dem das ins Zeitliche umgesetzte Gegenstück in der israelitischen Vorschrift liegt, daß das Opfer des Passahfestes nicht bis Tagesanbruch vorhanden sein dürfe[64]. Ferner soll das Blut dieses Opfers nicht zusammen mit Gesäuertem geschlachtet werden[65]: vom Gesäuerten gehen zersetzende Kräfte aus, welche die Blutwirkung beeinträchtigen müßten. In dynamistischen Zusammenhang gehört auch das Verbot, dem Passahlamm einen Knochen zu zerbrechen[66]; hier nämlich hätte ein gewisser Parallelismus der Kräfte, der sich zwischen der Herde und dem zu ihren gunsten geopferten Tier auswirkt, zur Folge, daß auch die Herde gegen Knochenbruch nicht gefeit wäre[67]. Dagegen lasse ich unerörtert, ob das Wasserausgießen, von dem man in der Samuelsgeschichte liest[68], aus einem Gedanken unmittelbarer Kraftwirkung heraus zu verstehen ist, als das es sich auf Grund eines entsprechenden Parallelismus der Kräfte z. B. im Regenzauber darstellt. Ebenso könnte ein Versuch, das Verbrennen des Opfers rein dynamistisch erklären zu wollen[69], leicht als bloße *petitio principii* erscheinen. Unzweideutiger wird man das Verbot einer Berührung des hochheiligen Opfers aus seiner Kraftgeladenheit ableiten dürfen. Und noch muß im Zusammenhang dieser Gedanken der Bedeutung der Siebenzahl gedacht werden, die im Opferritual öfter wiederkehrt, gehört sie doch zu den Zahlen, die als solche als besonders krafthaltige gelten. Endlich wurzelt letzten Endes die Opferschau, von deren Vorkommen auf israelitischem Boden das Alte Testament in der Kain- und Abelgeschichte[70] und wohl auch im 20. Psalm[71] letzte Spuren aufweist, in der Auffassung des Opfers als eines magischen Kraftträgers, wie denn überhaupt die Mantik in der Magie ihre tiefste Wurzel hat[72]. Auf germanischem Boden läßt sich besonders gut beobachten, wie im Opfersaal „das Ereignis geschaffen wird“[73]. Als das das Geschehen Schaffende aber muß das Opfer unmittelbar die Fähigkeit haben, dieses Geschehen auch irgendwie vorauszubilden.

---

[54] Vgl. Hos 2 15; Ex 11 2; 12 35; 33 6.

[55] Ex 19 15; I Sam 21 4f.

[56] Z. B. Lev 1 4.

[57] Anders erklärt sie z. B. René Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite*, Paris, 1921, S. 72f. Vgl. im übrigen meinen Leviticuskommentar zu Lev 1 4.

[58] Bertholet-Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* II, S. 47.

[59] Jaussen et Savignac, *Coutumes des Fuqarâ*, S. 46f., zitiert von A. Lods, Eléments anciens et éléments modernes dans le rituel du sacrifice israélite, *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, VIII, 1928, S. 407f.

---

[60] Ps 26 6.

[61] Gen 15 17; Jer 34 18.

[62] Unter Umständen auch in negativem Sinne wirkend, so (bei den Römern) zur Reinigung eines durch Blutvergießen befleckten Heeres (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* XVI, 1913, S. 314).

[63] Analog ist Ex 12 46.

[64] Ex 23 18; 34 25; vgl. Lev 7 18; 19 7. Entsprechendes in Arabien, s. J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*², S. 118.

[65] Ex 23 18; 34 25.

[66] Ex 12 46.

[67] Vgl. Bertholet, *Das Dynamistische im Alten Testament*, S. 40.

Doch ich breche ab, um nur noch ein Wort hinzuzufügen über das Verhältnis einer dynamistischen Opferauffassung zur *communio*-Theorie einerseits und zur Gabentheorie andererseits. Um mit der letzteren zu beginnen, braucht man nur die Opferung der Erstlinge sei es der Herde, sei es des Ackers, zu nehmen, um einen dynamistischen Untergrund noch durchscheinen zu sehen: der Teil als Opfer dargebracht verbürgt kraft magischen Zusammenhanges

---

[68] I Sam 7 6.

[69] Freilich wohl nicht als Sonnenzauber, wie G. Hölscher, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, Gießen, 1922, S. 34, Anm. 13, wollte.

[70] Gen 4 4f.

[71] Beachte das עַתָּה in v. 7.

[72] S. meinen Artikel „Mantik“, *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*^{2}, Bd III, Sp. 1977.

[73] Bertholet-Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, II, S. 574.

Segen und Gedeihen des Ganzen. Aber nicht nur das: dem ursprünglichen Sinn des Opfers als Gabe wird man nicht gerecht ohne die Erkenntnis, daß nach ursprünglicher Auffassung zwischen Gabe und Geber ein geheimnisvoller Kraft- und Stoffzusammenhang besteht, der auch fortwirkt, nachdem sich der Geber der Gabe entäußert hat. Ihr Empfänger gewinnt auf Grund der Tatsache, daß sie gewissermaßen ein Stück des Gebers ausmachte, über ihn Macht: der Geber begibt sich in des Empfängers Gewalt, von der er Förderung erhofft[74]. Und wenn uns das indirekt wieder auf den Gedanken der *communio* führen könnte, so wäre zu diesem ohne alle Schwierigkeit noch ein direkter Weg aus der dynamistischen Opferauffassung ausfindig zu machen: Ist das Opfer kraftgeladen, so versteht sich das Bestreben des Menschen, dieser Kraft selber teilhaftig zu werden, ganz von selbst, und vielleicht scheint das am besten dadurch zu geschehen, daß der Mensch durch eigenen Genuß des Opfers dessen magische Kräfte in sich überleitet. Das wäre wenigstens die Vorstufe seines höheren, fortgeschritteneren, rein theistischer Auffassung des Übersinnlichen entsprungenen Strebens, durch den Opfergenuß die Gemeinschaft mit dem personhaft vorgestellten Numen zu erlangen.

Ich habe dem Herold der *communio*-Theorie Einseitigkeit in der Betonung seiner Auffassung nachgesagt. Schon muß ich vielleicht befürchten, mich mit meinen Ausführungen über dynamistische Opferauffassung in den Verdacht nicht minder großer Einseitigkeit zu begeben. Dafür bin ich gerne bereit, mich von vornherein der Korrektur zu unterwerfen, die durch das von mir zu Anfang Betonte gegeben sein dürfte, daß wir dem Verständnis des Opfergedankens nur gerecht zu werden vermögen, wo wir eine Mehrheit seiner Wurzelmotive anerkennen.

[74] Vgl. meinen Artikel „Gaben", *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*², II, Sp. 843.

CORRECTIONS IN THE APPARATUS OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA IN THE LARGER CAMBRIDGE SEPTUAGINT

MAX L. MARGOLIS
DROPSIE COLLEGE

IN the course of revising my manuscript of a new edition of the Book of Joshua in Greek according to the critically restored text and with copious apparatus (now in course of publication) I gratefully made use of the apparatus in the Larger Cambridge Septuagint in order to obtain the evidence of mss. not accessible to me and then, for me equally important, to check up the data in my own apparatus when the material used by the Cambridge editors was accessible to me immediately from photographs. The following is a number of rectifications I have been able to make in the Cambridge apparatus. It will be seen that a good many concern data cited by the editors from Holmes-Parsons. As my aim is to serve users of the Cambridge volume, they ought to welcome rectifications of any kind which will go to remove inaccuracies from a publication for the existence of which we are all beholden to the learned editors.

I. 1, l. 3, for *δουλω* r. *δουλου*;
l. 4, for *θεου* r. $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$;
l. 5, omit $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ and before 'b$_2$' add 'a$_2$';
l. 10, transfer '*οικετη* $\overline{\kappa o\upsilon}$ (so r. for $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$) p^b' after 'a$_2$' on l. 5;
3, l. 9, transfer 'a$_2$' after 'x' on l. 8;
9, l. 5, omit '𝕮';

13, l. 1, add ‘u’ after ‘t’;

l. 4, before *υμων* add ‘*ο θεος υμων*] om 𝔈’;

14, l. 8, for ‘h’ r. ‘o’;

15, l. 12, omit ‘x’;

17, l. 2, omit ‘k’ and before ‘*μωυ-*’ add ‘*μωσει* x:’;

18, l. 2, from below, after ‘d’ add ‘p’.

II. 1, l. 5, after ‘x’ add ‘On-l’;

l. 14, omit ‘Or-gr’ (it belongs to the second *εισηλθοσαν*!);

2, l. 3, after ‘z’ add ‘𝔏’;

l. 4, after ‘𝔆’ add ‘(*ωδε την νυκτα*)’;

4, l. 3, for ‘𝔈’ r. ‘𝔄’;

8, l. 5, after ‘q’ add ‘u’;

9, l. 8, omit ‘x’;

l. 9, after ‘g’ add ‘n’ and omit ‘*ο* $\overline{θς}$ *υμιν* $\overline{κς}$ n:’;

10, l. 4, from below, before ‘*αμμορραιων*’ add ‘om *δυσι* 𝔈’;

last line, after ‘r’ add ‘u’ (*εξολο*—);

11, l. 8, before ‘i’ add ‘p*’;

14, l. 15, after ‘a’ add ‘i’ and after ‘t’ add ‘<74>’, omit the remainder of the line;

16, l. 1, after ‘z’ add ‘a_2’;

18, l. 2, before ‘𝔏’ add ‘𝔈’;

l. 12, before ‘om’ add ‘om *και* 4^0 — *σου* 4^0 𝔈’;

21, l. 2, for ‘*σου*’ r. ‘*σον*’;

l. 6, after ‘𝔏’ add ‘𝔖^m’;

22, l. 7, omit ‘uid’;

23, l. 2, before ‘*νεα*—’ add ‘om *δυο* 𝔈’;

24, l. 3, for ‘b’ r. (presumably) ‘b′’.

III. 1, l. 3, omit ‘pr *ipse et omnes filii Israel* 𝔖^m (sub ※)’ and l. 9, after ‘𝔈’ add ‘𝔖^m (sub ※)’;

3, l. 7, omit ‘(—*ρετε*)’;

4, l. 2, omit ‘o’;

7, l. 2, adter ‘*αρχωμαι* n’ add: ‘*αρξομαι* Or-gr’;

10, l. 4, from below, after ‘𝔄’ add ‘𝔖^m’;

11, (in the lower margin) add before ‘*διαβαινει*’: ‘*κυ*] *α′ κυριευοντος σ′ δεσποτου* 𝔖^m’;

12, l. 6, after ‘t’ add ‘x’;

15, l. 4, from below, omit ‘<71>’;
in the lower margin at the end of the verse, add ‘*την κρηπιδα αυτου*]α′ ܐܣܩ̈ܘܦܗܘܢ 𝔖^{m}’ (Rahlfs in *Bibl. Syr.*, 27);
16, l. 12, the reading of 84 is ‘*απο δαμμιμ* (*μ* 1^{0} suprascr) *της πολεως*’;
l. 23, after ‘ℭ’ add ‘𝔈’;
lower margin, l. 1, after ‘*b*’ add ‘𝔖^{m}’.
IV. 3, l. 8, omit ‘+’ before ‘*εκ μερους* gn’;
l. 16, ‘*οισετε* a’, so corrected for ‘*ησετε*’ prima manu;
8, l. 11, after ‘𝔅’ add ‘ℭ’;
9, l. 3, omit ‘a$_{2}$’;
l. 7, before ‘*υπο*’ add ‘*γλενομενω* u |’;
10, l. 15, before ‘*και* q’ add ‘prm *και διεβησαν οι υιοι* $\overline{\textit{ιη}}$*λ* 𝔖$^{m\ mrg}$’ (of course, *διεβησαν* = ܥܒܪܘ for ܥܒܕܘ = *εποιησαν*), and after ‘q’ read ‘|’ for ‘:’;
l. 18, omit ‘: om 84’;
12, l. 1, omit, ‘*διεβησαν δε* d:’ and before ‘g’ add ‘d’;
l. 8, after the first ‘:’ add ‘*διεσκευγασμενοι* u’;
13, l. 1, after ‘:’ add ‘pr *cum essent circiter* ℭ:’;
15, l. 6, omit ‘k’;
l. 7, omit ‘a$_{2}$’;
18, l. 4, before ‘*επεθηκαν*’ add ‘*και* 2^{0} sub −̣ 𝔖^{m}’;
20, l. 1, before ‘*ελαβεν*’ add ‘om *ους* — *ιορδανου* 𝔈’;
21, l. 3, after ‘a$_{2}$’ add ‘(-*σουσιν*)’;
23, l. 1, before ‘*ημων*’ add ‘om *τον θεου ημων* 𝔈| ’;
l. 6, after ‘𝔄’ add ‘𝔖’ (ܕܥܒܕܘ, prob. inner-Syriac error);
l. 12, after ‘s’ add ‘b$_{2}$’ and omit ‘<*ημων* 4^{0}] *υμων* 71>|’;
24, l. 5, after ‘y’ add ‘a$_{2}$’ and l. 6, after ‘m’ add ‘o’.
V. 1, l. 1, after ‘𝔄-cod’ add ‘𝔈’;
l. 6, after ‘n’ add ‘b$_{2}$*t’;
in the lower margin, for ‘*Chananaei*’ r. ‘*Chananaeorum*’;
l. 2, last line, omit ‘(uid)’ (Thdt has it not only in the title, but comments on it later on: *το τοινυν εκ δευτερου την αληθειαν προτυποι κτλ*);
in the lower margin, last line at the end, add ‘*καθισας*]σ′ *παλιν* 𝔖^{m}’;

3, l. 7, omit '(uid)';

last line, before '*βουνου*' add '*βουνος*]' and for '𝔖' r. ': om 𝔖';

5, l. 13, before 'v' add 'u';

l. 16, omit 'a_2 b_2';

last line, after 'r' add ': *μααβ*— k';

in the lower margin at the end of the verse, add '*μαδβαρειτιδι*] *λεξ. εβρ. μαδβαριτ. ερημος ερμηνευεται* i';

6, l. 3, after 'B' add 'h^b';

l. 8, omit '𝔖^m (uid) (*του θεου* sub ÷)', see my monograph on Syrus Masii, § 15, n. 14;

7, l. 2, after 'j' add 'k' and after 's' — 'u' (*ε* 1^0 ex corr);

8, l. 3, omit 'pr *παν το εθνος* x:' and on the next line after 'k' add 'x';

9, l. 3, from below, after '*γαλγαλα*]' add '*γαλγαλ* ℭ';

10, l. 6, omit 'Or-lat';

l. 10, for 'om ℭ^m' r. 'om ℭ^c';

12, l. 9, after 'x' add '𝔖';

15, l. 9, transfer 'Or-lat' in the previous line before 'Eus' (see editor's note).

VI. 3, l. 9, omit 'M' (according to the Specimen Page);

4, l. 18, after 'd' add 'g' and omit '*σαλπιωσι* g';

in the lower margin; 4, l. 1, before '*et*' add '(*α'* 𝔖^m)';

9, l. 11, omit '<pr *πορευοντες και* 18>:';

13, l. 10, omit 'N' and after 'f:' add '*προσπορευοντο* N';

l. 4, from below, after 'j' add 'k';

15, l. 5, from below, omit 'k';

16, l. 4, omit '<+*εν σαλπιγξι* 18>:';

17, l. 3, after 'Bqru' add 'ℭ𝔏';

in the lower margin, 13, l. 1, '*και* 3^0 — *οχλος* 1^0' should be altered into '*και* 5^0 — *οχλος* 2^0' in accordance with the Syriac manuscript and exactly as Lagarde has it, though in truth the ascription belongs to the complex indicated by B.-M.;

18, l. 2, from below, omit 'p';

19, l. 2, from below, omit ': (om 118)';
20, l. 2, omit '128';
22, l. 3, from below, after first ':' add 'αυτης 𝔏';
23, l. 3, for 'A' r. 'A*' (so it seems to me);
l. 3, from below, after ':' add 'αυτης 𝔏';
24, l. 6, after '𝔏' add '𝔖^{m}';
25, l. 4, omit '(*eorum* 𝔖^{m})';
l. 7, after 'Thdt' add 'Or-lat $^1/_2$';
26, l. 9, om 'αν' and after 'αναστηση, οικοδομηση' add '(-σει x*)';
l. 14, after 'l' add 'y*';
l. 19, for 'οζοβ' r. 'αζοβ', after 'g' add 'n' and omit 'αζαμ n:';
l. 21, after '>' add 'om ℭ^{f}';
l. 23, after 'ℭ' add 'ℭ'.
VII. 1, l. 7, after 'b$_2$' add ℭ'';
2, l. 10, after 'b$_2$' add 'On';
4, l. 4, after 'w' add 'x';
7, l. 6, after 'σου' add '(σου in margine)';
l. 2, from below, omit 'προς x:';
8, l. 3, before '*b*' add 'N';
l. 4, after '𝔄' add 'ℭ';
10, l. 2, s., 'Chr' is cited twice, for 'ουτω συ' and 'om συ';
11, l. 4, before '𝔏' add 'ℭ';
12, l. 2, after 'ℭ' add '𝔖^{m}';
13, l. 1, after 'k' add 'x';
14, l. 3, omit ':<+αυτων 76>' (the ms. has +υμων with 'pt');
l. 6, after 'u' add 'y';
l. 8, before 'o' add 'n';
l. 15f., omit <οικον 2^0] δημον 64>|';
last line, omit ':<οικον 64>';
15, l. 6, omit '+ τω αναθεματι x:' (the ms, reads εν τω αναθεματι, hence included under 'rell');
16, l. 2, omit 'x' (the ms. reads as 'rell');
l. 6, after 'f' add 'g' (written ἀνεδεῖχθη; hence 15, ἆν

εδεῖχθη is apparently meant for *αν* <*αν*>*εδειχθη*, correct accordingly the entry l. 3 s.);

17, l. 11, omit '𝕮' and on the next line add '𝕮' after '𝕬';
l. 12, after '*o*' add '(*του* F^c)';

18, l. 6, after '*Zamri*' add '*secundum uiros*';
l. 11 s., omit '<pr *και* 128>';

19, l. 5, for 'b' r. (presumably) 'b′' (so 𝔩; Lagarde has a predilection for the ms, b′);

20, l. 2, omit 'A';

21, l. 3, omit 'i' (the ms. adds *καλην* with 'rell');
l. 11, n reads '*διδραγμον*';
in the lower margin, l. 2, after '*ποικιλην*' add '(*καλην*) and before '*κειται*' add '*ουτως*';

23, l. 2, before 'om' add 'om *αυτα* 𝕮|';

24, l. 5, omit ': *χαριμ*';
l. 6, omit ': om x';
l. 8, omit '(uid)' (ܐܙܠ reproduces the simplex, comp. 24. 8; similarly ܐܬܐ 15. 9 for the intransitive verb; *αναγειν* is ܐܣܩ, comp. the present verse at the end; on Masius see my monograph, § 11, n. 5);
the same line, *perduxerunt* 𝔏 is *ανηγαγον* (not *ανηνεγκαν*) as at the end of the verse;
l. 16, after the third perpendicular line add '*και τα υποζυγια αυτου* post *και* (*παντα*) *τα προβατα αυτου* 𝕮|';
l. 2, from below, om '𝔖' (ܥܘܡܩܐ is the equivalent of *εμεκ*);

25, l. 4, before '𝕮' add 'k';

26, l. 7, after '𝕮' add '𝕮'.

VIII. 2, l. 11, after 'a_2' add '𝕮';
l. 16, after 'a_2' add ': om 𝕮';
last line, after '𝕮' add '𝕮';

4, l. 1 s., omit '<pr *ιδετε οτι* 84>' and l. 2 after 'x' add '<84>;
l. 6, omit ': om k' and before 'a_2' add 'k';
l. 12, omit 'kq' (for 'k' see the line before and for 'q' see l. 7 s.);

5, l. 6, omit 'om *εις* n' (written *ησ*);

6, l. 6, before '*uicti*' add '+';

7, l. 1, at the end, insert 'om *εκ της ενεδρας* ℭ|';
8, l. 9, before 'a_2' add 'i*';
9, l. 2, after 'u' add 'b_2';
12, l. 4, for '*τη* gn: *η*' r. '*η* gn';
14, l. 2, omit 'h';
l. 8, omit 'om *τον ο*' (the ms. writes *ετ̀σ*);
17, l. 6, 18 reads *και εν βαιθηλ*;
18, l. 4, from below, omit '| om *και* 128';
19 at the end, add '| om *εν πυρι* ℭ';
20, l. 1, omit '<om *και* 1^0 84>';
l. 6, from below, before '𝔏' add 'ℭ (uid)';
21, l. 2, before '*ισραηλ*' add 'om *και πας* $\overline{\iota\eta}$*λ* ℭ';
l. 5, after 'w' add 'b_2';
22, l. 4, after 'ℭ' add '𝔈';
l. 11, after 'z(mg)' add 'a_2' and omit '+ *αυτους* $\overline{\iota\eta}$*λ* a_2:';
24, l. 5, after 'q' add ': om ℭ';
l. 9, omit '84';
l. 11, '*donec* 𝔄' = *εως ου*;
l. 15, omit '<*και επ* 84>';
26, ll. 3, 4, 5, 7, omit '(mg)' after 'k';
27, l. 6, h* reads *επρονομευσαν* (incidentally h^b, cited on next line, does not delete the initial *ε*).

IX. 1, l. 7, before 'h' add 'g(uid)';
4, last line, after 'g' add 'n' and omit '*θυσιαστηριον ειρηνικας* n:';
5, l. 4, omit 'o';
6, l. 2, after the first perpendicular line add 'om *και* 2^0 — *αυτων* 1^0 ℭ';
l. 9, for 'b*' r. (presumably) 'b′';
l. 11, after 't' add 'u';
l. 3, from below, after the first perpendicular line add '$\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$] + *τοις υιοις* $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$ u(mg)|';
7, l. 3, after 'w' add 'x';
l. 4, after '𝔏' add 'Or-lat' and omit '*id est*' Or-lat:';
l. 6, rewrite '*κατα*] <*και* 74. 76>: om ℭ';

l. 7, the implication is that ‘z(mg)’ omits *μωυση*, but contrast l. 8f.;

l. 10, at the end, after ‘l’ add ‘x’;

11, l. 2, ‘*κοιλω* n’, hardly so, the ink has simply faded away, the scribe wrote *κοιλα*;

l. 5, after the bracket, add ‘*κατεπεπελματομενα* u:’;

l. 12, after ‘h’ add ‘i’ and on l. 13f. omit ‘: +*αυτων* i’;

12, l. 3, from below, omit ‘<*ηκαμεν εκ της γης μακροθεν* 84>’;

15, l. 2, omit ‘(uid)’;

l. 2, from below, after ‘z(mg)’ add ‘a_2’;

16, l. 2, after ‘q’ add ‘a_2’;

17, last line, omit ‘.18^b’;

18, l. 5, transfer ‘$i^{a?}$’ to previous line after ‘g’;

the same line, before ‘*απο*’ add ‘+’;

19, l. 3, at the beginning, add ‘om *καινους* $𝕮^f$’;

22, l. 4, after ‘w’ add ‘𝕮’;

23, l. 3, after ‘d’ add ‘g’;

l. 6, before ‘y’ add ‘x’ (*χεφιρα*);

l. 10, for ‘*βηρωδ*’ r. ‘*βηρως*’;

24, l. 5, omit ‘<pr *τον* 84>:’ (the ms. reads *τον* $\overline{\kappa\nu}$ $\overline{\theta\nu}$);

28, l. 5, for ‘*non*’ r. ‘*ab eis qui sunt*’;

30, l. 6, om ‘a_2’;

l. 10, omit ‘o’;

l. 12, for ‘*και εξολεθρευσαι ημας*’ r. ‘*εξολεθρευσατε — παντας*’;

the same line, omit ‘u’.

X. 1, l. 13, transfer ‘p’ before ‘t’;

2, l. 4, omit ‘ <*αυτον* 76>:’;

l. 7, omit ‘u’ and in the next line after ‘t’ add ‘u’;

3, l. 7, omit ‘*φεδραμ* $b^{a?}$:’ and after ‘N’ add ‘$b^{a?}$’;

l. 8, for ‘*φεναν*’ r. ‘*φεραν*’;

l. 11, after b add ‘(*ιαφι* $b^{a?}$)’;

the same line, omit ‘<*ιαφα* 76>:’ (the ms. reads *σιαφα* with ‘dt’);

l. 15, after the last but one ‘:’ add ‘*Dabit* $𝕮^f$:’;

4, l. 4, omit ‘<pr *τον* 74>:’ (the ms. has $\overset{\wedge}{\tau}$ = *την*);

5, l. 6, after '*b*' add '(ιη̅λ̅ *b**)';
l. 8, after the first ':' add 'ιερεμουθ o:';
l. 3, from below, omit '*' after '18';
6, l. 7, before 'om' add 'om το ταχος 𝕰^{f}';
8, l. 6, after 'f' add 'g';
9, l. 5, in front of '+' add 'om 𝕰 :';
10, l. 5, omit '<om εν γαβαων 84>|';
l. 6, after 'b' add '𝕮';
l. 7, after 't' add 'u';
l. 12, after '𝕮' add '𝕰';
l. 3, from below, omit 'αζηκω *b*';
l. 2, from below, after 'F^{b}' add '(mg)';
11, l. 1, before 'F^{b}' add 'A' and after 'h' add 'i';
l. 2, omit '<και εγενετο εν δε τω 84>:';
l. 3, for 'εκφευγειν' r. 'εκφυγειν';
12, l. 12f., omit 'κατ]επ 74 |';
l. 13, omit 'υιων 84:';
l. 4, from below, for 'ιλωθ' r. 'αιλωθ';
l. 3, from below, omit 'εκπολεμησωμεν 76';
13, l. 4f., omit '<τους εχθρους αυτων]το εθνος τιον εχθρων 76>|' (the ms. reads exactly like 'dpt' on the next line);
l. 12, after ']' add 'om 𝕮';
last line, omit 'δυσμαις g(uid)|';
the same line. after 'z' add '<18>' and omit '.18' at the end;
16, l. 3, after 'gn' add '𝕮 (uid)';
18, l. 2, from below, before '𝕰' add '𝕮';
20, l. 3, from below, omit '(λοιποι)';
23, l. 6, for 'd' r. 'p';
l. 9, after the first ':' add 'ιαριμουθ i:';
24, l. 13, before '𝕰' (which, however, is questionable, since προπορευεσθαι is elsewhere expressed by *ḥora* exactly as is done here) add '𝕮' (the preverb προ — is expressed by the addition of a corresponding Coptic element; since here no such element is added, the Greek reading underlying ⲂⲰⲔ must have been προσπορευεσθε unless it was the simplex πορευεσθε);

26, l. 2, from below, before ‘*επι*’ add ‘*κρεμασμενοι ο*|’;
27, l. 5, after ‘a’ add ‘*’;
28, l. 12, after ‘k’ add ‘u’;
30, l. 10, after the first ‘:’ add ‘pr *το* Masius:’;
  l. 13, after ‘z’ add ‘𝕮’;
  l. 15, after ‘ƛ’ add ‘𝕮’;
31, l. 5, before ‘om’ add ‘*αυτη* u:’;
33, l. 6, after ‘*της*’ add ‘(initial *τ* missing)’ (the scribe meant to write a capital T at the beginning of the line to mark the section);
34, l. 1, before ‘*εκ*’ add ‘om *εκ* — (36) *αυτου* p | ’;
  l. 2, omit ‘dp’;
  the same line, omit ‘*εις*]*απο* p |’;
  l. 3, omit ‘p’;
  l. 4, omit ‘om *και* 3⁰ — (36) *αυτου* p |’;
36, l. 1, at the end add ‘(*οδολαμ* p)’;
  l. 2, after ‘h’ add ‘p’ (the corrections in 34, 36, aside from the one in 34, l. 2 concerning ‘d’ which rests on an oversight of the editors, rectify the mechanical character of the editors’ registration; as a matter of fact, the scribe of p made the omission as signalized by me by aberration of the eye from *αυτου* in 34 to *αυτου* in 36, his *απο οδολαμ* is no modification of *εις οδολλαμ* in 34, but the plus in 36 after *αυτου*, exactly where the scribe resumed his text sharing the plus with ‘dt’, i. e. with the group S_b);
37, l. 4, after ‘ƛ’ add ‘𝕮(uid)’ (𝕮 sets in with *αυτην* of the plus, not with *αυτην* of *περιεκαθισεν* v. 36 end which would have been in Coptic ϩⲓϫⲱⲥ instead of ⲧⲥ; uncertain of course remains the number, *ελαβον* or *ελαβεν*, hence my (uid)’);
  l. 6, before ‘G’ add ‘F^b’;
  l. 16, omit ‘f’ (see next line);
39, l. 6, before ‘*επαταξεν*‘ add ‘om *και* 3⁰ — *ξιφους* 𝕮 |’;
40, l. 15, after ‘d’ add ‘t’;
  the same line, for ‘*κατελιμπανεν*’ r. ‘*κατελιμπαν*’ and

l. 16, transfer 'Θ' to the next line before 'a';
l. 3, from below, after 'r' add '𝔈'.

XI. 1, l. 8, before '*μαρων*' add '*μαρρον* 𝕮^c:';
l. 12, omit '*σομεων* k:' and l. 15, after 'b' add 'k';
l. 13, at the end add '*Samoan* 𝔈:';
l. 15, after ']' add '*αζ*., K:';
2, l. 7, after 'u' add '𝕮^f';
3, l. 4, for '*εις*' 1^0 r. '*και* 1^0 — *ανατολων*' and after 'a$_2$' omit '𝔏', then l, 6, after 'r' add '𝔏' (𝔏 skipped from the first *και* to the second; its text coincided with that of 'gn');
l. 21, omit '*ερμων* h^b:' and after 'c' add 'h^b';
l. 3, from below, omit '*τους* 2^0] pr *και* 84 |' and l. 2 from below, '*τους* 6^0 pr *και* 84|';
5, l. 4, from below, before 'm' add 'a$_2$';
ll. 3 and 2 from below, 'e' is listed twice!
6, l. 2, from below, what does 'r$_2$' signify?
8, l. 2, after 'K' add 'd';
l. 4, from below, after 'b$_2$' add ': om 𝕮';
11, l. 6, omit 'F';
12, l. 2, for '*b*' r. '*b*^{a}?' and before 'b' add '*b**';
14, l. 2, after '*κτηνη*' omit '*αυτης*';
l. 4, after 'g' add 'h^b' (the corrector, it seems to me, deletes the initial *ε*) and after 'n' add 'p', omit 'h^b' in the sequel;
l. 10, for '*destruxerunt*' r. '*destruxit eos*';
l. 12, for 'y' r. 'y$^{a(uid)}$';
15, l. 2, from below, 128 does not omit *τω*;
16, l. 9, for '*ναδεθ*' r. '*ναγεθ*';
l. 18, is 'b' meant for 'b′'? on the other hand, after 'd' add 'g' and after 'm', 'n';
17, l. 5, transpose 'a$_2$' after 'k' and omit ': *ααλαχ*', omit also '<*αλαακ* 128: *αβλακ* 71>:' (in both the reading is *ααλακ*);
l. 7, before '𝔈' add '𝕮';
l. 15, omit '<*βαλγηδ* 71>:' (it reads *βαλγαδ*);

18, l. 3, omit ': om 76. 84' (both mss. agree with 'dpt');
19, l. 2f., omit 'εγενετο]ην 76';
l. 5, after 'z' add 'a_2';
21, l. 3, from below, before 'ορους' add 'om παντος 2^0 ℭ|';
22, l. 4, omit '<εν γη των 76>:' (the ms. reads as 'dpt');
l. 7, after ']' add 'ασεδδω ℭ';
the same line, before 'b_2' add 'N' and on l. 10 omit 'N';
l. 11, after '𝔄' add 'ℭ';
23, l. 8, after 'w' add 'om ℭ^{f}'.
XII. 1, l. 2, after 'B' add 'G' and l. 3, before 'ℭ' add 'ℭ';
l. 4, omit 'pr *o* 74:';
2, l. 2, after 'i' add '*';
l. 13, after the first perpendicular line add 'om της φαραγγος ℭ';
4, l. 7, for 'ραφαιν' r. 'ραφαι';
5, l. 3, 'non liquet v', but contrast l. 6;
l. 5, after 'A' add '*';
l. 6, after '𝔏' add '(*s* inter lineas)' (of course, the reading without 's' is the one originally intended — FAGA corrupted from EAGA = εαγα < εαχα —);
l. 15, after the first perpendicular line add 'om και 3^0;
last line, for 'εσεβοβ' 'εσεβοκ';
7, l. 6, before 't' add 'p(uid)';
l. 11, after 'G' add '(βαααγαδ)';
in the lower margin after 'αλωκ v' add ': του μεριζοντος k';
8, l. 6, for 'καφιατεμ' r. 'καφιατεβ';
l. 17, after 'd' add '(κανακαιον)';
in the lower margin, before 'ναγεβ' add '(εν)';
11, l. 2, after 'A:' add 'ιαρημουθ ℭ';
12, l. 2, from below, for 'ζαρ' r. 'ζηρ';
13, l. 1, 84, it is true, omits here 'βασιλεα δαβειρ', but at the head of v. 15 it adds 'και βασιλεα δαβιρ';
20, l. 2, after 'r' add 'u' and l. 3 omit 'αμοων u';
l. 4, for 'ασαμβρων' r. 'ασανβρων';
l. 5, for 'σαμνων' r. 'σαμρων' and in the parenthesis for 'ν 1^0', r. 'ρ';

l. 16, for ‘ιαζιφ’ r. ‘αιαζιφ’;
21, l. 2, omit ‘θανεχ 71:’;
l. 8, omit ‘μακκεδω 64’ (the reading is μακεδδω exactly as in ‘a’, i. e. the entire group ᴀ);
l. 9, for ‘αφεγγης’ r. ‘αφενγης’;
22, l. 6, before ‘b’ add ‘a’ and l. 7, after ‘r’ add ‘u’ and after ‘𝔄’, ‘ℭ’;
l. 11, omit ‘<84 κοδναμ>’;
23, l. 3, after ‘𝔖’ add ‘On’ (incidentally for ‘11, 12’ of the editor r. ‘12, 23’);
l. 15, for ‘γγαιη’ r. ‘γαιη’;
l. 15f., omit ‘<αγωγιμ 128>:’;
24, l. 2, omit ‘θερσει 74:’;
l. 2, from below, omit ‘λα′ p^a:’.
XIII. 3, l. 1, after ‘q’ add ‘ℭ (uid)’;
l. 2, from below, for ‘*Auon*’ r. ‘*Auonin*’ and strike out accordingly in 4, l. 2 ‘: *inde* 𝔏’ (the editors unnecessarily rely on false division of words by Robert);
4, l. 1, after ‘s’ add ‘ℭ’;
l. 7, after ‘a_2’ add ‘ℭ’;
5, l. 2, after ‘u’ add ‘𝔏’;
l. 13, for ‘κ’ r. ‘γ’;
6, l. 2, after ‘|’ add ‘*Ma‘alaseret* μαιμφωμαιμ 𝔈’;
l. 4, for ‘— ρεμμεν —’ r. ‘— ρεμμεμ —’;
l. 7, omit ‘μασερεφωθαιμ 76’;
l. 9, transpose ‘a_2’ to l. 5 after ‘x’;
l. 13, omit ‘<64>’;
7, l. 1, omit ‘νυνι n:’;
8, l. 12, transpose ‘t’ after ‘p’;
l. 14, after the second ‘:’ add ‘*dedit* 𝔏’;
ibid., after ‘ℭ’ add ‘𝔈’;
10, l. 2, omit ‘𝔞’;
l. 4, ‘<pr βασιλεως 84>:’ the ms. rather has σηων βασιλεως repeated;
12, l. 4, omit ‘i*’ (the ms. has εν on the line; in front of it on the top of the line is written εν, but that belongs

as ending to *εβασιλευσεν* written compendiously *εβασιλ*);

13, l. 3, omit ‘<*γεσσερι* 74>’;
l. 10, before ‘*βασιλευς*’ add ‘om *και* 4^0 𝕮^{l}’;
l. 13f., omit ‘<*του γεσσερι* 74>’;
l. 16, before ‘*μαχαθι*’ add ‘*μοχαθει b*:’;
16, l. 5f., ܘܡܕܒܚܐ ※ and ܡܣܡܘܪ to change places;
l. 7, before ‘𝔏’ add ‘𝕮 (?)’;
17, l. 2, after ‘n’ add ‘t’;
l. 5, before ‘*μεισωρ*’ add ‘om *τη* u|’;
l. 12, omit ‘*b*’;
l. 3, from below, after ‘a’ add ‘$b^{a?}$’;
last line, for ‘*βααλων*’ r. ‘*μααλων*’;
18, l. 8, omit ‘<*κελμαν* 74>:’;
l. 2, from below, omit ‘<*μασσεφαθ* 74>:’;
19, l. 7, omit ‘<*σεραθα* 84>:’;
l. 2, from below, omit ‘(uid)’;
20, l. 2, omit ‘d’ and ‘p’ and on l. 4, before ‘*βεκφογωρ*’ add ‘*βεφθογωρ* dp:’;
l. 4, for ‘*βεθφεγορ*’ r. ‘*βεθφογορ*’;
l. 8, omit ‘*ασιδω b*’ (it appears to me that *ι* was inserted by $b^{a?}$) and l. 9, add ‘*b*’ after ‘G’;
in the lower margin, after ‘nom’ add ‘et praemisso *η*’;
21, l. 9, after ‘x’ add ‘: *Edom* 𝕮^{l}’;
l. 14, omit ‘.’ after ‘*σουρσι*’ (incidentally over the *ι* the ms. has a line: $\overline{\iota}$);
22, l. 4f., om ‘*εν τη ροπη*] *in pugn a*𝕮𝕾’ and on l. 5, after ‘y^{a}’ add ‘𝕮𝕾’ (see my paper in JBL, XXXIII (1914), 286ff.);
l. 5f., omit ’<*τριτη* 128>:’;
26, l. 5, from below, for ‘*μεαν*’ r. ‘*μεαγ*’ and for ‘*αμεαν*’, ‘*αμεαγ*’;
for ‘*βηθναμαραν*’ r. ‘*βηθναμραν*’ and omit ‘(uid)’ also
27, l. 1, omit ‘128’;
l. 15, omit ’: *βηθναρμα* 128:’;
l. 16, omit ‘<*βεθαραβα* 84>:’;

28, l. 6, after ‘(uid)’ add ‘𝕮’;
31, l. 4, for ‘*εστερωθ*’ r. ‘*εσταρωθ*’;
32, l. 3, from below, omit ‘x’.
XIV. 1, l. 1, after ‘r’ add ‘u’;
2, l. 1, after the first ‘|’ add ‘*κληρους*] *δημους* 𝕮^t; in the lower margin, before ‘*φυλης*’ add ‘*ιησου*]*σ′ α′ μωση b*’;
3, l. 7, ‘*φυλη* p’, hardly so, the word is written per abbrev. exactly as in v. 2;
6, l. 5, for ‘*ααλεβ*’ r. ‘*γαλεβ*’;
l. 8, before ‘𝕷’ add ‘𝕮^c’;
l. 2, from below, after ‘y’ add ‘a$_2$’;
7, l. 2, after ‘𝕮’ add ‘^{t}’;
8, l. 2, after ‘a’$_2$ add ‘b$_2$’;
last line, for ‘om *μου* 2^0’ r. ‘*μου* 2^0]) *nostrum* 𝕮: om’;
9, l. 6, omit ‘𝕷 (uid)’ (see e. g. Ge 17. 16);
10, l. 2, before ‘*τουτο*’ add ‘om *ον τροπον ειπεν* 𝕮’;
12, l. 8, before ‘𝕷’ add ‘𝕮’;
13, l. 4, from below, after ‘b’ add ‘(om *b*$^{a\,?}$)’;
ibid., after ‘Θ:’ add ‘*τω χενεζαιω* b$_2$’.
XV. 3, l. 1, after ‘|’ add ‘om *της προσαναβασεως* 𝕮’;
l. 2, after ‘𝕮’ add ‘𝕮’;
4, l. 3, after ‘𝕮’ add ‘(uid)’;
l. 8, ‘post *οριων* 𝕾’; but the position was inevitable in Syriac and was not taken over from the Greek (as Masius erroneously thought);
last line, after ‘n’ add ‘𝕮 (uid)’;
6, l. 1, for ‘*επιβαινει — βαιθαραβα*’ r. ‘*τα ορια — προσαναβαινει*’;
8, l. 8, before ‘*νοτου*’ add ‘*λιβους* d:’;
10, l. 19, after ‘g’ add ‘n’ (the scribe writes per abbrev. *π\ο* both for *πολιν* as 6. 15 a. e. and for *πολεως* as e. g. 8.6; he relies on the reader to find the appropriate case and here the genit. is the most natural as indeed it is so read by the entire recension S);
11, l. 6, for ‘*διαβαλλει*’ r. ‘*εκδιαβαλλει*’;

13, l. 2, the reading ‘*ιεφονηη*’ is not found in ‘18’ but in ‘o’; last line, for ‘*εν*’ r. ‘*ενα*’;

14, l. 2, omit ‘<*ιεφονηη* 18>:’;

l. 7, omit ‘i’;

l. 12, for ‘*σισιμμιμ*’ r. ‘*σισυμμιμ*’;

l. 13, 128, it seems to me, reads ‘*θαλμαι*’;

l. 14, after ‘:’ add ‘*thalami*’ Or-lat;

17, l. 3, after ‘Or-lat’ add ‘*Genez* 𝔈’;

18, l. 3, from below, before ‘*χαλευ*’ add ‘*χαλεφ* 𝔈^{c}:’;

19, l. 4, before ‘txt’ add ‘𝔖^{m}’;

21, l. 4, omit ‘<*υιων ιουδα* 84’> (reads as ‘dpt’);

l. 15, omit ‘<128 >’;

23, l. 6, for ‘*εσωρ*’ r. ‘*ασωρ*’ and omit ‘(*ασ*-x)’ and ‘uid’ after ‘On’;

25, l. 2, omit ‘*αασωρ b*’ and on the next line for ‘b′’ r. ‘b’;

l. 5, after ‘x’ add ‘𝔖’;

l. 6, after ‘𝔈’ add ‘On-lat’ and l. 8 at the head add ‘*εσωρ* On-cod’ (the editor of On errs in assigning the item to ll. 1);

27, l. 3, omit ‘<*ασερσαδα* 71>:’;

l. 9, omit ‘< pr *και ασεβων* 128>’;

28, l. 5, omit ‘*σαρσουμα* b_2’ and in the preceding line, after ‘N’ add ‘b_2’;

l. 5, from below, for ‘*β και ιωθια*’ r. ‘*και βιζιωθια*’ and omit ‘(uid)’;

l. 4, from below, after ‘G’ add ‘(*εβεζιου*)’;

29, l. 4, after ‘c’ add ‘o’ and omit ‘*αβειβ* o:’;

l. 7, for ‘*αναυαθ*’ r. ‘*εναυαθ*’;

last line, for ‘*αυε*’ r. ‘*αυι*’;

30, l. 5, for ‘*ελθωσαδ*’ r. ‘*ελθωγαδ*’;

l. 3, from below, omit ‘*χωσειδ*’ and transfer ‘18’ before ‘128’;

34, l. 1, for ‘*εβεξ-*’ r. ‘*εβεζ-*’;

l. 4, omit ‘*ραβιν* 74:’ (the ms. reads *ραμιν* as ‘dgpt’);

l. 6, from below, for ‘*ταπφ*’ r. ‘*θαπφ*’;

l. 4, from below, after ‘r’ add ‘𝔏’;

35, l. 9, omit '<νεμβρυ 128>: (the ms. reads νεμβρα);
36, l. 8f., omit '<γαλδειρα 84>:' (the ms. reads γαδειρα)';
l. 9, at the end, add 'om και i*:';
38, l. 8, omit '<νασσηφα 128>';
l. 10, omit '<84>';
l. 11f., omit '<ιαχθαηλ 71>:';
39, l. 4, omit '*b*' and in the next line for 'b'' r. 'b';
l. 4, omit '<βασεχαθ 84>:' (the ms. reads as 'dpt');
l. 5, omit 'βαξκαθ a$_2$ (uid)' (the ms. clearly reads 'βαζκαθ');
40, l. 2, from below, omit '<βελθωθ 76>:';
46, l. 3, from below, omit, '<εδωδ 64>:';
48, l. 1, after '𝔏' add '𝔖';
l. 5, omit '<σιχοκ 71>:' (the reading is σοχω);
50, l. 2, omit '<αναμ 128>:';
l. 3, from below, omit 'αναιμ 128';
52, l. 2, omit '<εριμ 84>:';
53, l. 2, omit '<αμμιν 74>:';
l. 9, omit '<βεθαπφους 128>:';
54, l. 2, from below, omit': ιθ' g';
55, l. 3, after '64' add '128' and in the next line omit '<χυρμεα 128>';
l. 5, omit '74' and '84';
57, l. 4, omit '<θαμνωθα 64>;';
59a, l. 14, after 'ℭ^{t}' add ': *Taton*';
l. 21, omit '<γαλομ> 71:' (the reading, it seems to me, is 'γαλειμ');
60, l. 8, omit '<καριαθαριμ 84>:';
l. 9, after 'h' add 'ℭ^{c}';
62, l. 3, for '*Sacoza*' r. '*Socoza*'.
XVI. 2, l. 4, from below, after 'B' add 'ℭ^{c}';
3, l. 6, after '64' add '128' and omit l. 9 '<ιεφλαιτει 128>:';
l. 6, omit 'τον ιεφαλθι a$_2$';
l. 10, for 'γεφθαλειμ' r. 'νεφθαλειμ';
6, l. 6, for 'b' r. '*b*';
l. 18, omit '<γην δοθαιμ 84>:';

l. 23, omit ‘*circumibit sibi* 𝕾’ and after ‘x’ add ‘𝕾’;
7, l. 7, omit ‘<*δαμα και μααvα* 84>:’;
l. 8, omit ‘<*μααvω* 76 :’;
last line, before ‘*επι*’ add ‘*απο του ιορδανου* 𝕮^t (uid)’ — as a matter of fact, **ϫⲓⲛ** is inner-Coptic error for **ⲉϫ̅ⲙ̅**, but as l. 4 from below the identical variant is cited this one should have been listed likewise;
8, l. 1, at the head, add ‘*και* 1^0 sub ÷ 𝕾^m;
l. 1f., omit ‘<*ταφφου* 74>:’;
l. 7, omit ‘<+ *ταφφου* 74>:’;
l. 10, after ‘*χειμαρρουν*‘ add ‘(—*ρρον* i)’;
l. 11, omit ‘: om Θ’.
XVII. 1, l. 7, after ‘n’ add ’: *γαλααт* 𝕮^t;
l. 10, omit ‘om *την* 2^0 74:’;
2, l. 16, after ‘]’ add ‘*Sumarim* 𝕮^c:’;
l. 3, from below, omit ‘<*σεμιραμε* 128>:’;
3, l. 4, from below, for ‘*μααγα*’ r. ‘*μααvα*’;
l. 3, from below, after ‘z’ add ‘: *ουα* 𝕮^c’ (of course inner-Coptic error);
4, l. 10, after ‘gn’ (see Appendix) add ‘𝕷’;
l. 12f., omit ‘*κληρονομια δια προσταγματος κυριου* 64>’ (the ms. reads as ‘a’, i. e. prefixes *κληρονομια* and continues *δια προσταγματος* $\overline{\textit{κυ}}$ *κληρος*);
l. 13, for *κληρος* 𝕮^c has *κληρονομια*;
in the lower margin, after ‘𝕾’ add ‘(sub *α′ σ′* 𝕾^m)’;
5, l. 2, from below, omit ‘: *μανασση* 76’;
6, l. 5, omit ‘*’ after ‘18’;
7, l. 19, for ‘*ιασειμ*’ r. ‘*ιασειβ*’;
8, last line, omit ‘<*τω* 128:’ (the ms. omits *τοις* — — (9) *ορια* 1^0 with ‘a’ i. e. with ᴀ);
9, l. 2, after first ‘|’ add ‘*φαραγγαν b**|’;
l. 8, after ‘|’ add ‘*φαραγκα b*|’;
last line, before ‘𝕷’ add ‘𝕮’;
10, l. 5, with reference to ‘b’, I find that the corrector in ‘*b*’ reads ‘*αυτοις*’;
l. 6, after ‘:’ add ‘*ιασηλ* 𝕮^f:’;

11, l. 3, after ‘G’ add ‘d’ and in the next line omit ‘*ισαρχαρ* d:’;
l. 5, omit ‘u’;
l. 5, from below, for ‘*μαφεθ*’ r. ‘*μαθεφ*’;
ibid., omit ‘74.’;
13, l. 6, omit ‘u’;
14, l. 4, omit ‘𝔏’ (omit accordingly also on l. 3 ‘pr *non* 𝔏’ since *non* is obvious error for *nos*, see Robert);
15, l. 1, before ‘*ιησους*’ add ‘om $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ — — *εἶ* 𝔈’;
l. 2, from below, after ‘d’ add ‘i’, after ‘n’ add ‘o’ and after ‘z’ add ‘a_2’;
16, l. 6, after ‘𝔄’ add ‘ℭ’;
17, l. 5, omit ‘𝔖’.
XVIII. 7, l. 2, after second ‘|’ add ‘om *εν υμιν* u’;
l. 4, after ‘p’ add ‘^{a}’ (the first hand wrote *ηρατεια*) and after ‘a_2’ add ‘𝔏’ (*quia*= *οτι*);
l. 4, from below, before ‘Θ’ add ‘G* (uid)’;
9, l. 9, after first ‘|’ add ‘om *επτα μεριδας* 𝔈|’;
10, l. 5, after ‘h’ add ‘(*εν σηλωμ* in mg)’;
11, l. 4, before ‘*και*’ add ‘*αυτου* 𝔈:’;
12, l. 4, from below, for ‘*μαδβαδαριτις*’ r. ‘*μαδβδαριτις*’;
l. 2, from below, omit ‘<*βαιθαιν* 128>:’ (the reading is *βαιθαυν*);
13, l. 1, before ‘*λουζα*‘ add ‘*ορια*] *ορη* 𝔈|’;
l. 4, after ‘(uid)’ add ‘𝔈’ and l. 5, after ‘𝔏’ add ’: *επι* 𝔈’;
l. 9, for ‘*Orec*’ r. ‘*Corec*’;
14, l. 2, after ‘B’ add ‘ℭ’ (comp. 16. 6);
16, l. 16, omit ‘*ραφαιν*’;
l. 22, omit ‘: *επι την γεενομ*’;
17, l. 5, omit ‘u’ and in the next line after ‘l’ add ‘u’;
l. 4, from below, omit ‘*βααν* u:’;
l. 3, from below, transfer ‘x’ before ‘On’ and omit ’:*βον*’;
18, l. 2, omit ‘u’;
19, l. 3, omit ‘x’;

l. 8, omit '*καιθαγλαα* 76' (the reading is as in 'dpt');
21, l. 2, omit '<pr *φυλης* 128>:' (the reading is as 'rell');
l. 6, omit '76';
l. 9, omit '<*βεθλαγα* 74>:' (reads as 'dpt');
ibid., omit '<*θαγλα*> 64' (reads as 'a');
l. 11, for '*αμεκασης*' r. '*αμεκκασης*';
22, l. 1, omit '*βηθαβαρα*' and in the next line omit first ':' and transfer 'x' after 'N';
23, l. 1, omit '<128>';
l. 9, before 'g' add 'd' and in the next line omit '*εφα* d:' (see Gardthausen, Table 11);
24, l. 3, from below, before '𝔏' add '𝔈';
25, l. 1, omit '*γοβαων* p(uid)' (for *ο* I see a clear *α*);
l. 6, omit '*βηφρωθ* $b^{a?}$, and in the next line after 'A Θ' add '$b^{a?}$';
26, l. 6, omit '<*κεφιν* 74>:';
l. 9, omit '*αμωσαι* b_2:';
28, l. 3, for '*σελααφ*' r. '*σελααλφ* (-*λαααφ* x)' and before 'x' add 'On';
l. 16, after 'a_2' add 'On'.

XIX. 1, last line, after 'l' add 'n' (written per abbrev., but undoubtedly meant for the gen. sing.);
2, l. 6, after 'y' add '(*σταβεε*)';
l. 2, from below, for '*μολαδα*' r. '*μολοδα*';
l. 4, '*ασερσουλ* $b^{a?}$', but I see after '*υ*' another character which is prob. intended for '*α*';
l. 5, for '*ασαρεουαν*' r. '*ασαρεουαλ*';
ibid., for '*σαρασουαμ*' r. '*σαρσσουαμ*';
l. 9, after 'B' add 'h' and in the next line omit '*ιαων* h:';
4, l. 2, omit 'o' (see l. 5);
l. 3, omit '*ελθωδαλ* 128:';
5, l. 3, omit '<*ιχαμ* 84>:';
l. 11, for '-*χωβωβ* (*ω* 1^0 ex *α*)' r. '-*χαβωβ* (*α* 4^0 ex *ω*)';
l. 2, from below, for '*ασαρσουσαλ*' r. '*ασαρσουαλ*';
ibid. and f., omit '<*αερσουλα* 18>:';

6, l. 4, omit ‘<βεθλααβωθ 76>:’;
l. 5f., omit ‘<βαιθλααμωθ 74: βαιθλααβαθ 84>:’;
7, l. 9, after ‘*b*’ add ‘a?’ and in the next line after ‘b′’ add ‘*b**’;
l. 3, from below, omit ‘<ασααν 84>:’;
8, l. 9, omit ‘.128’;
l. 13, omit ‘<ιαμνεθ 76. 84:>’;
l. 14, omit ‘<εις ιαμμεθ 74>:’;
9, l. 3, after ‘z’ add ‘a_2’;
12, l. 1, note that 𝕮𝕾 express the aor.;
l. 15, omit ‘χασελωθ a_2:’;
l. 16f., ‘χασελλωθ b’, but *b* reads ‘χασελλαθ’;
l. 19, omit ‘δια n:’ and after ‘g’ add ‘n’;
l. 22, for ‘μειρων’ r. ’διαμειρων’;
13, l. 2, before ‘𝕷’ add ‘𝕮𝕰’;
l. 6, omit ‘<γετθα εφθα 128>:’ and after ‘18’ add ‘128’;
l. 7, omit ‘γεθθερ a_2: γεθθαρ u:’ and in the next line after ‘o’ add ‘ua_2’;
l. 8, for ‘θαγεθα’ r. ‘θεγεθα’;
l. 9, omit ‘<γεραρε 76>:’;
l. 10, omit ‘pr *et* 𝕷:’ and l. 7 for ‘*Gaethar*’ r. ‘*Gaetharet*’;
l. 10, omit ‘(uid)’;
l. 11, omit ‘πολεις 74|’ (it is written $\pi o\lambda^{\ddot{\frown}}$ which, of course, is πολιν, Gardthausen, 337);
l. 15, omit ‘δαμνα On $^1/_2$’ (the item is to be assigned to 21, 35!);
last line, for ‘νουδρνουα’ r. ‘νουδρινουα’ and note that 18 omits also αμαθαρ;
14, l. 4, after ‘t’ add ‘u’;
l. 7, for ‘ex α’ r. ‘ex ν’;
15, l. 1, ‘𝕰’ is cited twice;
l. 10, omit ‘<εναλλατ 84>:’;
l. 5, from below, after ‘m’ add ‘u’ and in the next line omit ‘βεεθλεεμ u:’;
16, l. 3, after ‘r’ add ‘𝕰 (uid)’;
l. 4, after ‘𝕰’ add ‘(uid)’;

18, l. 3, after ‘l’ add ‘x’ and for ‘ιζαδελ’ r. ‘ιζαρδελ’;
l. 5, after ‘𝔏’ add ‘(*Hasaloth*)’;
19, l. 1, at the head, add ‘om και 1^0 — σιωνα sa$_2$’ and on l. 2 omit the readings of s and a$_2$ (see later);
l. 2, omit ‘u’ and l. 3 after ‘o’ add ‘u’;
l. 5, omit ‘om και 2^0 — ρεηρωθ sa$_2$’;
l. 10, after second ‘:’ add ‘ρεναθα a$_2$:’ and after fourth add ‘αρενεθ s:’;
l. 11, ‘t’ reads ‘βηθιρα’;
20, l. 3, omit ‘<ραμμωθ 18>:’;
l. 6, after first ‘|’ add ‘om και 3^0 — (21) ιεων ej|’ (see later);
l. 8, omit ‘γομαθ ej:’;
l. 2, from below, before ‘i’ add ‘G’ and after it add ‘u’;
last line, omit ‘<αεβε 128>:’ and ‘G’;
21, l. 1, omit ‘om και 1^0 — τομμαν ej |’;
l. 3, after ‘x’ add ‘On(-lat)’ and in the next line omit ‘ιερμωθ On:’ (the latter belongs to 21, 29);
l. 10, after ‘+’ add ‘και’;
l. 13, before ‘p’ add ‘d’ (see above, p. 237) and omit ‘φαμεθ d:’;
l. 14, after first ‘:’ add ‘γομαθ ej:’;
22, l. 3, for ‘βεθαφαθ’ r. ‘βεθαφωθ’;
l. 9, omit ‘𝔖’ (comp. 4, 18);
l. 10, for ‘βαιωθσαμε’ r. ‘καιωθσαμε’;
l. 13, for ‘βαιθσαμς’ r. ‘βηθσαμς’;
l. 14, after ‘>’ add ‘ℭ’;
last line, after first ‘:’ add ‘εξ]εκ *b*’ and for ‘γ′’ r. ‘ς′’;
23, l. 2, from below, omit ‘om αι’ and before ‘128’ add ‘64.’ and then omit the last line altogether;
26, l. 1, omit ‘a’;
26, l. 10, ‘δαμεσταλα gn’, note that in ‘n’ it is written per abbrev. ‘$\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau_{\alpha}^{\lambda}$’;
27, l. 8, for ‘βαθαγων‘ r. ‘βαιθαγων’ and omit ‘(uid)’;
l. 20, after ‘𝔈’ add ‘(-μεχ)’ (comp. the reading of ‘q’);
l. 22, omit ‘<σαφθαβηθβεμε 128>:’;

l. 25, omit '<*ιφθαβηθλεεμ* 76>:';
ibid., for '*Iefab*' r. '*Iefabetchet*', accordingly l. 28, after 'uid' add 'om 𝔏:', l. 30 after 'rell' add '𝔏' and l. 30f., omit '*Chetaniel* 𝔏:';
l. 26, after 'On' add '(*βηθλεεμει* On-cod)';
l. 33f., omit '<*χαβαλ* 76>:' (the reading is *χοβαλ*);
l. 34, omit '<*χαβαλα* 128>:';
ibid., omit '<*χαβω* 71>:';
28, l. 1f., 2f., omit '*ελβα* On $^1/_3$' (belongs to Judges 1. 31) and '*αβδων* On $^1/_3$: *αρδωμ* On-cod $^1/_3$:' (goes with Joshua 21. 30); accordingly, l. 4, omit '$^1/_3$' after 'On';
l. 5, omit '*ρααγβ* d:';
29, l. 2f., omit '<om *εως* 76>';
l. 9, at the end, add '*στυριων* 𝔈^f|' (*στ* may be a Greek error or *st* may have been induced in Ethiopic from *ụesta* above);
l. 13, after '|' add '*εσται*]*εστι* 𝔈|';
l. 3, from below for '*αχσεικ*' r. '*αχσειβ*';
30, l. 2, omit '*ακχω* On $^1/_2$:' (belongs to Judges 1. 31);
31, l. 3, after '𝔈' add '𝔈';
33, l. 2, omit '<*μελεεφ* 128>:';
l. 4, omit '*μοθλαθα* 76 uid:';
l. 5, after '𝔈' add ':ܡܠܦܐ ܡܢ 𝔖' (of course, taken directly from Peshitta);
l. 7f., omit '<*μαλα*> 84:';
l. 17, omit '<*αναι* 74>';
l. 9, from below, omit 'o';
ibid., after 'b'' add '*b* (uid)';
l. 6, from below, omit 'a';
l. 2, from below, before '𝔏' add '𝔈';
ibid., after 'l' add 'o';
34 lower margin, after '*και*' add '(*ιουδα*)';
36, l. 1, after 'h' add '𝔏';
l. 2f., omit '<*αραβα* 84>:';
37, l. 7, omit '<71>';
38, l. 7, after first ':' add '*μαγλαδιηλ* i:';

l. 11, after 'm' add '𝔖' (of course, derived from Peshitta, though Mas, apparently without ms. evidence, places it sub ÷);
l. 13, omit '*βαιθμααθ* 74:';
l. 20, omit '*βαιθσαμυς* 76:';
41, l. 4, omit '<*σαραα* 76>:';
42, l. 4, at the end, add '*Amon* 𝕮:';
43, l. 2, omit '$^1/_2$' after 'On' (*αιλων* 30_{26} of the On belongs to v. 42);
l. 3, for '*ικαλωμ*' r. '*ιηαλωμ*';
l. 3f., omit 'g' and 'n' (see l. 1);
l. 7, after 'm' add 'p';
45, l. 2, for '*ιουλα*' r. '*ιουλ*';
l. 2f., omit '<*ιουθ και αζωρ* 84>:';
46, l. 1, after ')' add 'On';
l. 2, omit '$^1/_2$' after 'On' 1^0; also omit '*ηρακων* On $^1/_2$:' and in the next line after 'x' add 'On [[*ηρεκκων*]*ηρακων* On-gr]]';
48, l. 10, after ']' add 'pr *εκει* h*:' and in the sequel omit 'h*';
l. 11, after '𝔖' add 'On' (by inference from *λεσεμ. ταυτην οι υιοι δαν πολιορκησαντες εκαλεσαν δαν*) and accordingly l. 12, after ' 128>' add 'On' and l. 15 omit 'On';
49, l. 5, after ' | ' add 'om *τω υιω ναυη* 𝕮|' .
XX. 2, l. 1, before '*δοτε*' add 'om *δοτε τας πολεις* 𝕮^f|';
4, l. 6, omit '*φευξειται* 74:' (see Gardthausen, Tables 8 and 10);
l. 14, omit 'om *και* 4 — *αυτους* 84|' and l. 15f., after '74' add '84 𝕮';
l. 2, from below, after '74' add '84' and omit '*καθησαι* 84';
last line, omit '*μετ*]*επ* 74';
5, l. 10, omit '84' and in the same line and l. 11f., after '74' add '84';
l. 14, omit '*του* 2^0] *το* 84|';
6, l. 11, after '*ιερεα*' add '(-*αν* n)';

l. 18, omit ‘om *αυτου* 2^0 — *πολιν* 2^0 84|’ and l. 20, after ‘74’ add ‘84’;
7, l. 5, after ‘j’ add ‘: om 𝕮’;
l. 9, omit ‘: *συχεμι* u’;
8, l. 13, after ‘]’ add ‘*γαλααᴛ* 𝕮:’;
9, l. 1, after ‘|’ add ‘om *αι πολεις* 𝕮|’.
XXI. 1, l. 3, after first ‘|’ add ‘*ιερεαν* n|’;
ibid., omit ‘*και* 2^0 — *ναυη* post *πατριων* 𝔖|’ (so indeed Lagarde who inadvertently transposed two lines of the ms.);
l. 2, from below, after ‘𝔯’ add ‘𝕮’;
2, l. 2, from below, after ‘λ’ add ‘𝕮’;
3, l. 2, after ‘:’ add ‘om 𝕮:’;
4, l. 3, after first ‘|’ add ‘*τοις υιοις ααρων* post *τοις ιερευσιν* 𝕮|’;
l. 4, after ‘*ιουδα*’ add ‘*και*’;
l. 2, from below, omit ‘n(uid)’ (written per abbrev. *κλ*$^{\eta}$);
5, l. 5, transpose ‘d’ after ‘c’ (Gardthausen, Table 11);
last line at the end, add ‘*δεκατρεις* 𝕮^{f}’;
8, l. 2, at the end, add ‘*ον* — *μωυση* post *κληρωτει* 𝕮|’;
9, last line, after ‘n’ add ‘(*επεκ-*)’;
11, l. 6, for ‘*καθαρι-*’ r. ‘*καριαθ-*’;
14, l. 8, after ‘|’ add ‘om *και* 3^0 𝕮’;
l. 10, omit ‘<*τελλαμ* 84>:’;
l. 12, after ‘18’ add ‘.128’ and omit ‘<*ιεθεσον* 128>:’;
15, l. 6, before ‘𝔖’ add ‘<71>’ and 16, l. 3 omit ‘<*την ολων* 71>:’ and l. 8 omit ‘: *αιν* 71’;
15, l. 2, from below, omit ‘a$_2$’;
16, l. 2, after ‘a’ add ‘*b*^{a}’ and in the next line omit ’*την ιαιν* *b*^{a}:’;
l. 16, omit ‘*βηθσαμυς* 18: *την*’ and in the next line before ‘64’ add ‘18.’;
17, l. 4, after ‘A’ add ‘k’;
l. 8, omit ‘<*γαβσε* 128>:’;
l. 9, for ‘*γαμοε*‘ r. ‘*γαβοε*’;

18, l. 7, before ‘*αλβων*’ add ‘*την*’;
l. 9, omit ‘64.’ (the reading is *την αλμῶ*, hence *την αλμων* as ‘rell’);
last line, omit ‘t’;
19, l. 2, from below, after ‘r’ add ‘𝕮’;
21, l. 4, omit ‘*τη* u:’;
23, l. 2, after ‘r’ add ‘𝕮’;
l. 10, after ‘74’ add ‘.76’ and in the next line omit ‘: *γαιμαδδυν* 76’;
24, l. 3, before ‘e’ add ‘d’ and in the next line omit ‘*την αιγλωμ* d:’;
25, l. 10, omit ‘i’ after ‘B’;
l. 3, from below, after ‘x’ add ‘𝕾 On’;
26, l. 2, from below, after ‘n’ add ‘a_2’;
27, l. 7, from below, for ‘*βοσσορραα*’ r. ‘*βοσσορρα*’;
l. 5, from below, for ‘*βεθθαρα*’ r. ‘*βεεθθαρα*’;
29, l. 6, omit ‘n’ and after second ‘:’ add ‘*προς αυτην* n^{a} (*προς αυτας* n* ?):’;
l. 7, after ‘d’ add ‘n’;
l. 11, omit ‘n’;
pp. 765, 766, 767, on the outer margin and in the list of witnesses, for ‘𝕮^{c}’ r. ‘𝕮^{m}’;
p. 766, in the apparatus, before v. 30 add ‘30, 31 om n’;
30, l. 2, omit ‘n’;
l. 4, before ‘p’ add ‘d’ and omit ‘*μασσαμα* d:’;
l. 6, omit ‘n^{a}’;
l. 6f., omit ‘*προς αυτην* n*:’;
l. 8, omit ‘om *και* 3^{0} — (31) *αυτη* 2^{0} n|’;
l. 3, from below, after ‘:’ add ‘*αρδωμ* On-cod’ (in the edition r. ‘21, 30’ for ‘19, 28’);
31, l. 3, before ‘c’ add ‘*b*’ and omit ‘*αχαλκαθ b*:’;
32, l. 10, omit ‘*ναιμαθ* t:’ and in the next line, after ‘p’ add ‘t’;
33, l. 2, if the corrector of ‘n’ (‘n^{a}’) made of the reading ‘*γεσδων*’, then he merely omitted in ‘n’* the *θ*, accordingly n* will have written ‘*γεθσδων*’;

34, l. 2, omit '𝔈';
ibid., 'sub ÷ 𝔖' (so Lagarde who expressly notes that his ms. lacks the signs and that he bases himself upon Masius; Masius, however, obelizes the second, and not the first, *υιων*!); after the ':' add '*plebis* 𝔈';
35, l. 2, after 'ℭᵗ' add '𝔈';
l. 4, omit ': *λεβνα*';
36, l. 1, before '*περαν*' add '*και* 1⁰] *αι* k: om ℭᵐ|';
l. 3, after '𝔖' add ': ⲚⲦⲈ ϩⲒⲈⲢⲒⲬⲰ ℭ';
l. 9, omit 'ܡܫܘܪ, 𝔖' and in the next line after '𝔄' add '𝔖';
38, l. 7, after 'ℭ' add '(?)';
41, l. 2, omit ': *πασα* d';
42a, l. 3, after 's' add 'u';
42b, l. 3, omit 'x' and in the next line after 'w' add 'x';
l. 5, omit 'p(uid)';
l. 8, at the beginning, add '+ *πολιν* d:';
in the lower margin, 43 at the end, add '(glossa pertinet ad *καθοτι ωμωσεν* in comm. 44)';
45, l. 1, after '1' add 'uel 2' (the first hand will have read *διεπετασεν* with 64).
XXII. 2, l. 2, from velow, for '*et*' r. '*και τα*' and after 'ℭ' add ': om 𝔈';
3, l. 6, omit ': *πολλας*';
4, l. 2, from below, omit '𝔈' and in the next line after 'q' add '𝔈 (uid)';
5, l. 3, omit 'A' and in the next line after 'r' add 'ℭ' and before 'N' add 'A';
6, l. 2, omit 'p' after 'h';
7, l. 13, omit 'a_2';
8, l. 7, omit '.118';
l. 11, after third '|' add '*αργυριον, χρυσιον*] tr 𝔈|';
l. 14, omit '*και* 6⁰] sub ÷ 𝔖ᵐ (uid): om b_2|';
l. 4, from below, omit '<*την παρανομην πασαν* 84>:';
11, l. 5, from below, after 'o' add 'u' and in the next line omit '*γαλιωθ* u';

15, l. 2, from below, after 'q' add '𝔈𝔏';
17, l. 1, omit 'b$_2$';
l. 5, after 'k' add '(*ουκ ἐκκα-*)';
18, l. 5, after '𝔈 (uid)' add '𝔖^{m} (sub ※)';
19, l. 10f., it does not appear to me that the corrector of 'n' made any change in — *σατε* except that the original hand wrote — *ται* for — *τε*;
l. 24, omit '<*απο ημων μηδ αποστητε* 84>';
20, l. 5, from below, omit '<*μη ουτος εις μονος* 18>:';
22, l. 9, omit '<*κυριος* 64>:';
24, l. 5, omit 'b$^{a?}$';
25, l. 3, from below, after 'a' add ': *απηλλοτριωσουσιν* d';
27, l. 7, omit '𝔈' (see v. 28);
l. 5, from below, omit 'x';
28, l. 4, after 'x' add 'ℭ';
l. 5, omit '<*ιδε* 84>:' (the reading is as in 'dpt');
l. 3, from below, omit 'om' and after '2^{0}' add ']*η*';
29, l. 1, before '𝔏' add '𝔈';
l. 9, omit '<*και αποστηναι* 84>:';
l. 15, omit 'u';
l. 3, from below, after '|' add 'om *ο* — *αυτου* 𝔈^{f}|';
30, l. 7, omit '| om *ελαλησαν* — *και* 5^{0}';
31, l. 2, from below, before '*τοις*' add 'om *τους υιους* 𝔈|';
34, l. 8f., omit '<om *φυλης* 84>|';
l. 11, omit '*το* o:' (see Gardthausen, 339).
XXIII. 3, l. 4, after '𝔄' add ': *τοις* 𝔈';
l. 7, after second ':' add 'pr *αυτος ημων αυτος* d' (i. e. *ημων αυτος* is duplicated);
last line, after 'ℭ (uid)' add '𝔈 (uid)' (of course, both render freely);
4, l. 2, after '1*' add ': *uidistis* ℭ (= *ειδετε*, an orthographic variant misconceived);
l. 4, before '*επεριφα*' add '*επιρριφα* o:';
l. 9, after first '|' add 'om *υμων* ℭ|';
l. 2, from below, after 'k' add ': + *eos* 𝔖𝔈';
last line, after '|' add 'om *επι—ηλιου* 𝔈^{f}|';

ibid., after 'n*' add '| om *ηλιου* 𝔅𝔏';

6, l. 2, before '𝔏' add '𝔈';

l. 7, after first ':' add '*egrediamini* 𝔏:' (looks like a cross between *εκκλινητε* and *παραβητε*);

7, l. 2, after second ']' add '*istas quae derelictae sunt* 𝔏:';

l. 13, after ':' add '*adorabitis* ℭ𝔈:' and similarly line 2 from below, after first ':' add '*seruietis* ℭ𝔈:';

8, l. 3, after 'g' add '*appliciti eritis* 𝔏 (= *προσκεισθε*);

9, l. 8, for '*eos*' (misprint in Lag) r. '*uos*';

10, l. 8, for '-*ου*' r. '*ου*-';

l. 9, omit '<*αυτος συνεπολεμησεν αυτους* 84>:' (ms. reads as 'pt');

11, l. 2, after 'λ' add '𝔈' and in the next line omit '𝔈 (uid)';

l. 4, after '$\overline{\kappa\nu}$' add '$\overline{\theta\nu}$';

12, l. 1, at the head, add '*εαν γαρ*] *quodsi* 𝔏|';

l. 4, from below, after 'x' add '𝔖';

ibid., for '2^0' r. '3^0' and for '*αυτους*' r. '*αυτοις*';

13, l. 1, before '𝔈' add '𝔅';

l. 2, from below, after 'h' add 'i' and after 'z' add 'a_2';

14, l. 15, after '*εποιησε* n' add ':+ *nobis* 𝔅';

l. 17, after 'r' add '𝔅𝔈';

l. 5, from below, omit '*nobis*';

last line, after 'λ' add '𝔈';

15, l. 2, omit 'a' and 'a_2';

l. 5, omit '𝔖' (does service for the art.); similarly l. 15;

l. 13, for 'n' r. 'o';

16, l. 2, after first '|' add 'om $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ 𝔈|';

l. 9, after '84' add '𝔈' (the plus seems to be derived from De 11, 17).

XXIV. 1, l. 6, after 'km' add '𝔖$^{m\,mg}$';

2, l. 3, after second '|' add '*ο θεος* bis u';

l. 5, omit ': om u';

5, l. 6, omit 'u';

6, l. 6, omit '<*εις* 1^0] *επι* 84>';

l. 3, from below, before '*αρματι*' add '*αρμασιν, ιπποις*] tr 𝕰|';

8, l. 8, omit 'i';

9, l. 2, from below, after 'r' add '𝕰';

ibid. '𝕬𝕾', I do not see how it can be inferred from either that in the underlying Greek the accus. was used instead of the dat.;

11, l. 1, after '|' add 'om *εις* 𝕷|';

13, l. 8, before '*ους*' add '*και* 4^0 sub ÷ S^m|';

14, l. 1, after 'z' add 'a$_2$';

l. 2, omit 'pr *τω* 128:';

l. 5, after 'h' add 'k';

l. 7, omit 'i';

15, l. 7, omit '𝕾' (error in Lag);

l. 11, after '𝕰' add '(?)';

17, l. 3, from below, after '|' add 'om *και* 3^0 𝕰';

19, l. 10, after 'n' add '𝕷';

22, l. 1, after 'o' add ': om 𝕰^f';

l. 3, after first ']' add '*παρτυρες* d:';

l. 3, before 'q' add 'p* (uid)';

ibid., for 'i' r. 'p*(uid)';

25, l. 4, omit 'om *και κρισιν* k|';

26, l. 5, before 'k' add 'i';

27, l. 12, for '*ημιν*' r. '*υμιν*';

l. 5, from below, for '18*' r. '18';

ibid., omit 'y';

30, l. 1, for '*πραγματα*' r. '*ρηματα*';

31, l. 3, omit '*θαμναθασαραχ* n:' and in the next line after 'g' add 'n';

l. 7, after 's' add 'u';

ll. 9, 10, omit '*του ορους*';

32, l. 3, after second '|' add '*ιωσηρ* d|';

l. 9, before '*σικιμοις*' add '*των κατοικουντων*] pr *και* b$_2$|';

33, l. 2, from below, before '*αυτω*' add '*εδωκαν* d|';

33a, l. 8, after 'r' add '𝕰';

33b, l. 2, omit 'u';

l. 7, after ‘h’ add ‘ܙ’ (in the lower margin, 33, l. 4, ‘*seruiuit et*’, so Lag, but the ms. is mutilated r. ܠ ܦܠܚܢ); l. 3, from below, before ‘*εκυριευσαν*’ add ‘*κυριευσεν* N :’; l. 2, from below f., omit ‘<om *αυτων*3⁰ 84>|:’; in the lower margin, 33, l. 1, before ‘*εφραιμ*’ add ‘*εν γαβααρ*]*σ*’ ܒܓܒܥܐ ܙ|’.

HERMETIC RELIGION AND THE RELIGION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

MARY ELY LYMAN
NEW YORK CITY

THE fourteen[1] little tracts in Greek which make up the Corpus Hermeticum proper, together with the three Latin pieces which are grouped under the name Asclepius, have a peculiar interest for the student of the New Testament. Fragments as they are of a more extensive literature, they attract us by their blending of philosophical interests with those of mystical religion; they command our respect by their sincerity and sobriety; they pique our curiosity by their affiliations with Christian writings. Do we with Reitzenstein think of them as exerting an appreciable influence upon New Testament writers? Do we with LaGrange hold Hermeticism to be indebted to Christianity for many of its ideas? Or does our judgment, as I think is true of more of us today, lie somewhere between these two positions? In any case we recognize that there is light to be shed both on the New Testament itself and on the contemporary religious situation by the contemplation of these fragments of revelation-literature expressive of Egyptian philosophical mysticism.

For the student of the Fourth Gospel there is special interest in these documents, because of the similarity of the religious quest advocated by these pieces to that which the Fourth Gospel commends to its readers, and because of the common terminology employed by both. Again in its special bearing on the Fourth Gospel, Reitzenstein's position as stated in his *Poimandres* (1904) has been a challenge to the study of the two presentations of religion with this question of genetic relationships in view. Krebs's examination of Reitzenstein's position in his *Logos als Heiland* and LaGrange's study, L'Hermetism (*Rev. Bib.* Oct. 1924, Jan., April, July 1925) probably go too far in their correction of Reitzenstein. Krebs has tended to concentrate too closely upon the Old Testament influence on the Fourth Gospel, and in my judgment, LaGrange has not been cautious enough in his assertion of direct Christian influence upon the Hermetic writings. A greater conservatism regarding direct influence either way is commending itself more and more today, and three recent studies of the religious situation in the Hellenistic world (Angus: *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*, Willoughby: *Pagan Regeneration*, and J. Estlin Carpenter: *The Johannine Writings*) all indicate caution on this point. Angus may be cited as the spokesman of this position. He writes:

---

[1] The number of the treatises is usually held to be fourteen. Walter Scott in *Hermetica* divides the pieces differently and gets nineteen. p. 17.

> "To claim Hermeticism as the source of Johannine mysticism, and especially of the Logos functions, is as unwarranted as to claim Johannine thought as the main ingredient or even a permeating influence in Hermeticism... Both movements (Christianity and Hermeticism) were drawing to a large extent from the same speculative sources... Both were affected by the mysticism of their age, and both, seeking to enlist the serious minded, operated with the same terms of Life, Light, Truth, which were the catch-words of their contemporary Zeitgeist." *Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* p. 331.

It is from such a position that I take my cue for this study. As one examines these two presentations of religion, Hermeticism and the Fourth Gospel, one is impressed with the fact that there are real points of kinship between them, but also by the fact that there are deep differences in their handling of religious experience. They are so near to each other in some points, and yet so far in others. To the end that we may see more clearly their relationship to each other, I wish to review briefly some of the points of similarity between them and then to lay before you four major differences in their form and content. Such a paper as this cannot of course aspire to any complete comparison between the two systems of religion. My hope is to assist our understanding and appreciation of them both by this comparative study. For such a purpose we may set aside the question of influence one upon the other, and take as our starting-point the view just quoted from Angus.

But if we are permitted to be agnostic on the question of genetic relationship, we are not so fortunate in the matter of date. We must find at least an approximate dating of the Hermetic corpus, if this comparative study is to be of value. Again there is wide range in the suggestions that have been offered for its dating. At one extreme is the extraordinary view of Flinders Petrie in his *Personal Religion in Ancient Egypt* that the Hermetic writings go back as far as 500 B.C. and that they were completed by 200 B.C. At the other end of the scale is the view presented by St. George Stock in his article in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, which would place the whole composition between the years 313 and 330 A. D. Neither extreme is in my judgment tenable, and the general position of Reitzenstein on the date seems to me acceptable, even though his elaborate chronological scheme for the separate documents may bring us question. He places the literature as a whole in the first three centuries of the Christian era, a position which, though approximate as regards any single document, is adequate for the purposes of this study. We must recall in this connection the fact that a literature of religion is always preceded by the religion itself. The fact that this literature is so fragmentary, that it bears the obvious marks of being a composite production must also be borne in mind. Some of the naïve elements in the writing, such as the use of mythology, and the childlike reverence for the Egyptian deities, suggest pre-Christian origin for the conceptions if not for the writing. Tractate XVIII on the other hand with its elaborate encomium of kings has usually been taken as referring to Diocletian and his co-rulers and has been placed by Reitzenstein and others at the time of Diocletian's triumph in 302 A.D. These facts suggest that the fragmentary writings which we now possess represent the expression of a rather long development of religious speculation, whose origin was certainly pre-

Christian, but whose literary expression was probably contemporaneous with early Christianity. Upon this assumption, let us proceed to examination of the two religious systems.

There are many points of likeness which might be cited, but I am selecting a few which have struck me as I have compared these two systems of religion. Then I should like with these as background, to set forth briefly some of the points of difference. Let us turn first to the points of kinship.

Both are religions of redemption and of revelation. Both hold the knowledge of God as the objective of man's experience. The Fourth Gospel's affirmation: "this is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only true God" (17 3) has its counterpart in the Hermetic emphasis on the vision or knowledge of God as the full fruition of life

> "Rise above all time and become eternal; then you will apprehend God" XI. ii. 20b.[2]

In the tenth Tractate, Hermes says to Tat:

> "The vision of God is not a thing of fire, as are the sun's rays; it does not blaze down upon us and force us to close our eyes; it shines forth much or little, according as he who gazes on it is able to receive the inflow of the incorporeal radiance. It is more penetrating than visible light in its descent upon us; but it cannot harm us; it is full of all immortal life" X. 5.

Both expect this knowledge of God to come in a mystical experience which is dependent upon a new birth. The striking similarity in the handling of the new-birth concept has been one of the major points in the arguments for literary dependence one way or the other. Tat's word to Hermes in Tractate XIII:

> "I know not, Thrice-greatest one, from what womb a man can be born again" XIII. 1.

is strikingly like the question of Nicodemus to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel

> "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?" John 3 4.

---

[2] References to the tractates in this paper are given according to Walter Scott's arrangement of them in his *Hermetica*, Clarendon Press Oxford 1924.

And as the question is similar, so is the answer. Jesus replies that one must be born of water and the spirit, and Hermes replies to Tat:

> "My son, the womb is spiritual wisdom, conceiving in silence," and "The Will of God is the begetter." XIII. 2.

Later on in the colloquy, when Tat under the tutelage of Hermes has experienced the ecstasy, he cries out:

> "Father, God has made me a new being, and I perceive things now, not with bodily eyesight, but by the working of the spirit." XIII. 11a.

Both use in their handling of the mystical experience the key-words Life, Light, Truth. Both systems suggest a close relationship between the moral attitude of man and his attainment of the higher knowledge. In the Fourth Gospel, this connection is affirmed through the collocation of the *love* and *belief* concepts throughout the gospel. In the Asclepius, "saintly piety" is coupled with contemplation as a necessary step in the attainment of knowledge of God. In the Poimandres it is asserted that *νοῦς* comes only to those who are holy and good and pure (I. 22). And again there is considerable similarity in the language in showing how moral attitudes condition the higher knowledge. The Fourth Gospel puts it:

> "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." John 7 17,

while one of the Hermetic excerpts in the anthology of Stobaeus reads:

> "He who is religious (pursues philosophy) shall know where the truth is and what it is." Exc. II. B. 2.

Again, both systems partake of the dualistic philosophy so characteristic of the Hellenistic philosophical world. This dualism appears in the Fourth Gospel in the two worlds of light and darkness, and in the Hermetic writings in the pleroma of good and the pleroma of evil (VI. 4). In the Gospel, to be sure, the dualism has taken on far more of an ethical than a speculative character, and we shall have more to say of this difference later on, but at this point we may recognize that there is a common philosophical background which is their direct inheritance from the popular schools of Hellenistic thought.

Both the Fourth Gospel and the Hermetic religion use the Logos concept which they derive ultimately from Heraclitus, whether it comes as in the case of the Fourth Gospel more directly from Philo, or in the case of the Hermetic writings through the Stoics. The handling of the Logos concept in the two systems is a far larger question than this paper can undertake. Some suggestion of the difference in proportion between speculative and religious interests will appear as we discuss the differences between the two systems, but at this point we may merely recognize the fact that both systems found use for the Logos concept in the attempt to provide an adequate philosophical basis for their presentations of religion. That the Logos doctrine was taken over by the author of the Fourth Gospel as a means for commending his gospel to a world already familiar with the doctrine is self-evident in the oracular affirmation ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. So also the writer of the first Tractate, the Poimandres, introduces without argument or description, the spiritual word (πνευματικὸν λόγον) as an agent in the creative process. That the functions of the Logos are different in the two cases, we may recognize, though I think Angus is right in his comment that the creative and intermediary functions are not prominent in the Corpus Hermeticum proper. But in any case both systems found use for the concept in giving philosophical grounding to their presentations of religious experience.

A further likeness between the two systems is in their emphasis upon the inner community of believers. It has often been held to be one of the limitations upon the religion of the Fourth Gospel that it regards the inner company of believers as having their life apart from the world. J. Estlin Carpenter in his *Johannine Writings* suggests that this is one of the most profound differences between the Synoptic presentation and the Johannine. He says: "Their pictures of the Good Shepherd are based on different ideals. The one sets out to search for the wanderer, heedless of weariness or want; the other is concerned with the safety of those within the fold" (p. 391). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus' last prayer is not for the world but for his own who are not of the world (John 17 9). In the same fashion the Hermetic writers believed that the hard path of true religion was for the few. In the Asclepius we read:

> "There are not many religious men in the world, so few that they could be counted." Ascl. III. 22a.

At the close of the Poimandres, the Shepherd is represented as issuing his call to repentence to a great company of men. And out of the company many stood aloof and many mocked, but some few turned to him, and to them he gave the doctrine "how and in what wise they might be saved" I, 29. Both systems ally themselves more or less with the general Hellenistic notion of the esoteric religious community, though both of them contrast favorably in this respect with the mystery cults of the time. Both are free from excessive emphasis on secrecy, from the mystic pass-words and secret symbols which characterize the ritual of the cults.

And finally, both are on a higher level of thought and of experience than are the usual presentations of religion in their time. Even the story of Lucius's initiation into the Isis cult in the eleventh book of the Metamorphoses, which portrays to us the mystery cult at its highest, does not live on so high a plane of religious experience as do these two presentations. For neither in the Fourth Gospel nor in the Hermetic writings are there sacred times or seasons, set places of worship, or cultic acts. They are religions of inward experience, assisted by instruction, but ultimately received by revelation which the grace of God bestows. As Jesus in the Fourth Gospel asks his followers to do his commandment of love as their offering to God, so Hermeticism affirms that its followers should make their offerings those of pure speech (XIII. 21.) Jesus says of one who follows him "My Father will love him and we will come unto him and make our abode with him" (John 14 23) and the Poimandres document affirms: "God comes to those who are good and pure and merciful." (I. 22.) The Fourth Gospel in its great assertion about worship says:

> "The hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father... The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship in spirit and in truth." John 4 21, 23.

And on its part, Hermeticism affirms:

> "God is apprehended by thought alone" V. 10a and "Everywhere God will come to meet you... at places and times at which you look not for it, in your waking hours, and in sleep, when journeying by water and by land, in the night time and in the day time." XI. ii. 21b.

The mystery cult, even at its best, knew no salvation apart from some sacramental catharsis, some ritual death and revival like the one portrayed in the Metamorphoses; both Hermeticism and the Fourth Gospel were free from any such externalism, and found the heart of religion in the inward experience of the believer.

Upon this background which puts before us some of the points of kinship between the two systems, let us look now at four salient differences between them. The first that I bring up is so obvious as hardly to need comment, and yet it is one that has bearing upon all the rest of the comparison—the great divergence in the literary form in which these two interpretations of religion reach us today. On the one hand, we have in the gospel a homogeneous literary unit, the work, as I believe, of one author (though many suggestions of composite authorship have been made, and J. Estlin Carpenter presented with considerable persuasiveness in his recent work a theory of community authorship).[3] The religious experience advocated in the gospel has, I believe, been deeply entered into by the author himself, and he presents it with the glowing enthusiasm of one who has actually found in Jesus the way to eternal life. He chose as his literary medium a biographical form which had already found acceptance in the Christian community, and though he used this form with freedom, adapting it to his own purposes with anything but a slavish adherence to a given model, still the book comes to us, a definite literary type with conscious artistry behind it, a unified view of religious experience.

In the other case, we have in the Hermetic writings a bundle of fragments, of composite authorship, probably covering a wide sweep in time and representing many literary types, discourses, dialogues, prayers, hymns and visions. It is true that a certain genuine unity of thought and experience lies behind these documents; otherwise any such discussion of them as we have just now engaged in would be meaningless, but that unity has to be discovered through an extraordinary heterogeneity of literary form. Their variety is not confined of course to form; many differing points of view are represented in their content, but I presume this variety is not greater than that which appears in the writings of the New Testament. Since our comparison, however, deals with one New Testament writing only, we must recall that the comparison is already weighted on the side of difference, in this disparity of literary form. Angus suggests that if we had at our command today the same proportion of Hermetic writings that we have of early Christianity, the kinship in thought between the two would probably be more rather than less. And that may also be true as regards the Fourth gospel, where we have a whole to compare with a bundle of remnants.

---

[3] My view of the authorship allows for redactional work upon it, such as the addition of Chapter 21, and the rearrangement of certain passages.

In addition to this divergence from each other in literary form and personal background, there is a major difference in these two systems in their attitude toward cosmic problems. For Hermeticism, cosmic speculation is a primary interest; for the Fourth gospel, the problems of religion per se are paramount. The tenth Tractate of the Hermetic corpus is only making explicit what is implicit in the literature as a whole when it states:

> "There are then, these three, God, Man, and the World (ὁ θεός καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος). The Kosmos is the Son of God; Man is the son of the Kosmos and grandson, so to speak, of God." X. 14b.

These three centers of interest appear again and again as foci of speculation. The greater proportion of the discourses is upon them, and they are not absent from any one of the documents, except the little tract VII. which devotes itself solely to a plea for responsiveness to the religious life. All the others discuss at more or less length, the problems of being, of origin, of the nature and destiny of things as they are. The question of the origin of evil recurs again and again. Now its source is found in matter as in the Poimandres, now in the free will of man as in the Fourth Tractate. These themes are of great interest in the Hermetic writings, and certain of the tractates, such as II and III, are completely concentrated on this kind of problem.

How far this is from the world of thought in which the Fourth Gospel moves! As we have said, there is an appeal to philosophy on the part of the gospel. It wishes to identify its values with those of its surrounding world of thought and it employs the Logos concept to this end. It makes use of a dualistic world-view, but has so strongly ethicized the two worlds of light and darkness, that their real meaning is found in the ethical life of man. In the Fourth Gospel, philosophical positions are suggested. The prologue makes certain basic philosophical affirmations in an oracular fashion, but cosmic problems as such are never presented as subjects for instruction or debate.

In connection with the cosmic interests of Hermeticism we should note also the place of astral influence in the salvation of man. As part of its speculation upon things as they are, Hermetic religion asserts a vital connection between man's life and the structure and destiny of the universe. Man, in his descent through the spheres which followed immediately upon his creation, took on the passions of his nature, arrogance, lust etc. from the planets as he passed them:

> "And Nature wrapped him in her clasp and they were mingled in one." I. 14.

In the ascent of the soul which constitutes the mystical experience of gnosis, these passions are cast off and the soul finds spiritual consummation in God. Any such assimilation of the process of salvation to the interests of cosmic speculation is entirely foreign to the Fourth Gospel's view of life. From the background of contemporary religion we understand anew the supreme quality of the religion of the Fourth Gospel that it kept itself free from this kind of complication.

A third major difference between the two systems of religion is perhaps an outgrowth of the one just cited. Man's handling of his own life in the quest for oneness with God is quite different in the two presentations. The Egyptian mysticism uses the current asceticism of the day, not in any extreme fashion, but quite naturally and simply, as the primary requisite for the mystical experience:

> "If you do not first hate your body, my son, you cannot love yourself." IV. 6b.

Tractate VII applies a strange collection of epithets to the body. It is "a cloak of darkness, a web of ignorance, a bond of corruption, a living death, a conscious corpse, a tomb, a robber of the house, an enemy who hates the things you seek after and grudges you the things which you desire" VII. 2b. It is the body that "grips you and holds you down that you may not look upward and behold the Truth." VII. 3.

Again one appreciates afresh the genius of the Fourth Gospel as one approaches it from the angle of the contemporary religious situation. Hermetic religion was but making use, and this in a most conservative way, of that which was the common possession of the Graeco-Roman religious world in its acceptance of asceticism as the pre-requisite for religious experience. But how amazingly free from this entanglement the Fourth Gospel kept itself! It was a complete transcendence of its own time that gave the gospel such an affirmation as:

> "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." John 10 10.

But the major difference between the two systems of which I wish to speak is that which springs from the fact that the Fourth Gospel grounds itself in the historical life of Jesus, while Hermeticism looks back to an elusive literary tradition, with little to identify its mythical figures or individualize them one from another. It was merely an ancient literary convention that ascribed the writing of Egyptian scribes to Tat, the patron God of science and the arts. Sometimes Tat is identified with Hermes, sometimes he is presented as his son. As the source of revelation in the Hermetic religion, Hermes is a mere conventional mouthpiece for the views presented. Personality is completely lacking and there is nothing to Hermes and Tat but mere voices that carry the questions and answers. Is not this the difference between the two systems which is most determining for their future history?

Here, in Hermeticism, was a religion of real strength, one among many rivals to Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world. But as compared with most of its contemporaries, it was more spiritual, more sober, and had more to offer the thoughtful folk of the age. As Dr. Willoughby says, it was a living religion of great sincerity. It had, he believes, its communities, its leaders, its hymns and liturgies, its promises of individual salvation and immortality, but it had no grounding in history. It had at its center no personality who "having loved his own, loved them unto the end" (John 13 1). It had no personal embodiment of the religious ideal advocated:

> "That ye love one another, even as I have loved you." John 15 12.

Although Hermes is the thrice-great teacher, whose instruction lights the pathway to true knowledge, his role is always the abstract figure. He is not himself the personal revelation of God as is Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, who could say of himself:

> "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." John 14 6.

The warmth of personal relationship, the quickening of a personal embodiment of religion, the tragedy of personal suffering, the triumph of a personal spirit over suffering and death—all these differentiate the appeal of the Fourth Gospel's religion from that of the Hermetic writings. All these are factors in the genius of the work.

Hermeticism and the Fourth Gospel had many points in common. Together they are exponents of the higher ranges of religious life in the Mediterranean world in the New Testament period. But they also differ in such important respects as these we have listed. The literary form in which they come to us today is disparate in character. The proportional interest in cosmic speculation is vastly different. They disagree in their attitude toward asceticism. But is not this the greatest difference of all and the most determining one for their permanent religious value, that one looked back to a mere nebulous literary tradition, while the other was grounded in history and found in a personality the embodiment of the religious experience that it advocated?

PARONOMASIAS ON THE NAME JERUSALEM

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

JERUSALEM is the most famous city in the world's thought and language, and yet, despite the fact that Semitic names are generally ominous and so intelligible, the name of the Holy City has so far defied learned interpretation. And proportionately it has invited a kaleidoscopic variety of etymological and mystical explanation. The second element is indeed of a common Semitic root, but the ancient traditions vary as to the form and pronunciation of the first element, which is not patently Semitic. Over against the Hebrew Yerushalem, which itself was artificially developed into an apparent dual, Yerushalayim, the Akkadian offers *Uru-salim*, or *-immu*, for which we have the testimony not only of a late Assyrian historical text (Sennacherib's prism) but also of the Amarna tablets. Also Professor Chiera has now discovered the word used as a personal proper name in a list of Sumerian names, which corroborates the opinion of many scholars that we have in the name a non-Palestinian, probably non-Semitic element. And this Eastern tradition has survived in the Syriac form of the name, Urishlem.[1]

---

[1] Professor Speiser has kindly collated for me the cases published by Chiera, in *Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum*, XI. 1. They are listed under numbers 323—325: Uru-Silim, 'City of peace,' twice (no. 323); Uru-Silimmu, 'my City of peace', three times (no. 324); Uru-Silim-Gal, 'City of great peace,' three times (no 325).

The Holy City first occurs in the Bible in Gen. 14, with a curtailed form of its name, the second element Salem, the one element which could be at once etymologized by way of midrash; the city had to do with peace, *shalôm*, just as its king Melkisedek's name implied righteousness, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews comments, 7 1. It seems hardly ever to be questioned why this shorter form of the name is given upon its first occurrence, when there was every reason to clinch identification of the place with Jerusalem, so as to claim the patriarch Abraham's connection with it and his adoration of its primeval deity, the God Most High; and indeed that Jerusalem is meant is now generally acknowledged. But the reason is patent; according to the sacred tradition the first element of the name was not incorporated until the patriarch's second visit to the same environs for the sacrifice of his son Isaac, as narrated in Gen. 22. Here there is an evident play upon the phrase, v. 8, YHWH *yir'èh*, 'Y. will see,' in the name Abraham gave to the place, v. 14, 'Y.—yir'èh,' while the changes are rung upon the verb by the additional comment, variously interpreted, 'in the mount of Y. it is to be seen,' *yērā'èh*, or 'in the mount where Y. is to be seen.' Now it is indifferent in this midrashic etymology what the syntax or which the verbal stem be, and commentators take too much trouble in proving or denying the appropriateness of these etymologies. We may compare the interpretation of the sanctuary name, El-roi in the Hagar episode, c. 16, where the quite impossible text gives, "Have I even here seen the back(?) of him-that-sees-me?." Now similarly and as evidently *yir'eh* and *yera'eh* in c. 22 are paronomasias upon the element *yerû* in the name of our city. This has generally been overlooked by the commentators; of recent scholars I find that Delitzsch, Dillmann, Skinner, Procksch either ignore any etymological play, or (Dillmann) find the play upon Moriah. Nowack proposes a novel theory, that in the original form of the tradition the episode occurred at some otherwise unknown site which he names Yeru'el, and that the tradition was transferred to Jerusalem through the identity of the first element of the two names. But there is no valid reason to go beyond Jerusalem to obtain a local etymology of the first element of its name. And so with this later episode in Abraham's life that first element is accounted for, and consequently by the harmony of tradition which was working in the composition of the book as we have it, only the other element of the name, Salem, could be used for the episode of c. 14. And this solution is offered in the literature which has best preserved the ancient traditional spirit, namely in Midrash Rabba to Gen. 22 14; here the explanation is given that Shem called the place Shalem, but Abraham Yir'eh, and that the good Lord, in order to please them both, combined the two elements.[2]

According to most modern critics 'the Moriah' in 22 2 is an interpolation for identification with the later name of the temple hill, 1 Ch. 3 1. If so, there can be no question of the equivalence of *yir'eh* with Yeru(shalem). But Moriah itself offers a secondary play upon the same root, as appears from that verse in Ch., "the mount Moriah where Yhwh (restored from the Greek) appeared (*nir'ah*)."[3] We may accordingly deduce that at the time of this composition the interpretation of "the appearance at Moriah" had not yet entered into Gen. 22. But this play was early made on the passage in Genesis, where according to Jerome Symmachus translated Moriah by ὀπτασίας, and Aquila, less positively, by καταφανῆς.[4]

The two elements of the name still remained distinct units in later and even Christian language. In Ps. 76 2 Salem stands in parallelism with Zion, and Heb. 7 1 plays on this antique name. In the Greek and Latin Onomastica Jerusalem is interpreted as ὅρασις εἰρήνης, *visio pacis*.[5]

It is generally accepted that another play upon the name Jerusalem appears in Ariel as applied to that city in Is. 29 1. 2. 7. The same word occurs again in Eze. 43 15.. 16,[6] where, on basis of an Arabic root, it is generally translated 'hearth;' but the word would then be a composite strange in Hebrew, and must mean 'God's hearth.' Whatever be the meaning of the word, there is the evident play between *'arî* and *yerû*(*šalem*), *'el* balancing *šalem* as an equivalent divine epithet, or, along with the opinion of many scholars, itself a divine name, Salim.[7] It may be noted that there is a learned gloss in the margin of Codex Marchalianus (Q) to the Ezekelian passage interpreting the Greek transliteration αριηλ by the meanings, based upon our present Hebrew text, φῶς μου θεός, ἤτοι ὄρος θεοῦ; that is, Ariel is understood as Oriel (which reading indeed has been suggested by some scholars instead of Ariel). Now this interpretation would connect with the vocalization as we have it in the Akkadian-Syriac *Ur*-, and that tradition appears to have survived elsewhere in the Bible. The instance is in Is. 31 9, where the prophet speaks of Yhwh "whose fire (*'ûr*) is in Jerusalem and his furnace (*tannûr*) in Zion." Note that the rare word *'ûr* is used, not the common *'ēš*, and apparently with intention.

---

[2] Possibly in this etymology we have a reminiscence of the marriage of the ancient Jebus city on the Ophel and the temple hill to the north. For a translation of the Midrash see Wünsche, *Der Midrasch Bereschit Rabba*, p. 263.

[3] Yhwh has been omitted in the Hebrew text for the same reason that in 22 14 the Massorah avoids allowing that Yhwh is to be seen.

[4] It may be noted as a matter of interest for this etymology for Moriah as from *ra'ah* that one phase of stem IV of the same root in Arabic is *'aura*.

[5] See G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 1, 258, n. 1, for references. Smith's whole chapter (bk. 1, c. 9) on 'the Name Jerusalem' is an exemplary discussion. See also Vincent, 'Les noms de Jérusalem,' *Mnemon*, 6 (1912).

Passing into the Greek world the name was playfully graecized into Ἱεροσόλυμα, Latin Hierosolyma, as though 'Holy-Solyma.'[8] Again we have two elements, as in the Hebrew, but now the first element, obscure in the Semitic, has been metamorphosed into a recognizable Greek word, the second, evident in the Semitic, has been rendered hopeless of interpretation. The former element predicates the holy nature of the city, legal title to which distinction was given in the charter granted to the city by Demetrius I in Jonathan's favor, constituting the city formally as *ἱερὸς καὶ ἄσυλος* (Josephus, *AJ* xiii, 3, 2). And so Philo boldly calls Jerusalem Hierapolis (Mangey, ii, 524). But for a play on the whole word we must go to the pungent wit of the malicious enemies of the Jews. In a passage in *Contra Apionem*, i, 34, which I do not find listed in the ample studies of our name, Josephus cites a foul-mouthed Graeco-Egyptian writer Lysimachus (probably first century B. C.; see Schürer, *GJV* 3, 535), who, at the end of a vicious attack upon "the scabby and leprous" people of the Jews, tells how, because they robbed the temples, *τὰ ἱερὰ συλῶντας*, their city, when they came to occupy it, was first called *Ἱερόσυλα*. Josephus scented enough danger in the witticism to refute it seriously in the next chapter: "He did not understand that robbery of temples is not expressed by the same word and name among the Jews as it is among the Greeks." The wit is paralleled by the obscene perversion by the Muslim populace in Jerusalem of the name of the Church of the *Resurrection*, *ḳiyâma*, into *ḳumâma*, 'dung.'[9]

---

[6] In v. 15 the word is given as *har'el*, i. e. 'mount of God,' altough here the Greek has αριηλ as in v. 16, while the translations, including the Jewish Version, agree in rendering 'hearth.' *Har'el* is not, I take it, an error but an intentional change to make cross-reference to *har* Yhwh, Gen. 22 14; and it would be the earliest instance of exegesis of the syntax in that phrase.

[7] A possible explanation of Ariel, and one that has been seriously proposed is 'Lion of God.' Might this interpretation have entered into the fugitive Priest Onias's mind in locating his Egyptian temple at Leontopolis? The story in Josephus, *AJ* xiii 3, 3, makes him appeal to Scripture prophecy, to Isaiah specifically, the passage being generally identified in Is. 19 19ff. We may also compare Ps. 76 2, 'in Salem is his lair,' *sukkô*, a word generally used of a lion's habitat. For completeness' sake there may also be noted the midrashic interpretation of the name as ירוש שלם, 'possession of peace,' e.g. *Midrash Tehillim* at Ps. 76 2.

[8] For the early occurrences see Smith, pp. 259ff; the form appears to go back to at least 300 B. C. The rough breathing must soon have been popularly applied.

Outside of this witticism I know of no explanation of the second element Solyma. It is used by Josephus to render Salem, Gen. 14, he calls the Judaean hills the Solymitan mountains, etc.; and he cites Greek authors who used the word as commonplace. Indeed Solyma became a common name for Jerusalem with the Latin writers of the 1st century A. D., whose vogue Josephus probably adopted in his own affected usage.[1] Doubtless this form arose by deduction of the element *hiero-*, now regarded as adjectival; the barbarous word Solyma became logically the name of the city. It looks as if the vocalization of the word was a free musical growth. The plural, as which the Greek Hierosolyma is always treated, must represent the apparent dual of the Massorah.

---

[9] Lysimachus's joke throws light upon the Apostle Paul's accusation of Jews of his day, Rom. 2 22, *ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τα εἴδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖς*; Jews, having no awe of Pagan holy things, evidently acted as receivers of stolen goods from the temples without religious scruple.

[10] See Smith, pp. 262f.

Finally it may be noted that in Latin Christendom and its Protestant daughters it is the second component of the name that has prevailed when the word is analyzed, the Salem of the language of piety. In the tradition of the Greek Church and of its sphere, including Islam, the element *hieros* has dominated. For the Muslim Jerusalem is simply al-Kuds, 'the holy,' Bait al-Makdis, etc. Thus the Palestinian vernacular preserves the first element of the ancient name as filtered through the Greek.

STEPHEN'S SPEECH IN ACTS

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE apology or defence of Stephen before the Sanhedrin is presumably intended to be an answer to the charge that he had spoken against the Temple and the Law and had declared that Jews of Nazareth would destroy the Holy Place and change the traditional customs of Israel. If so, the object of the speech is to convince the Sanhedrin: (1) That the history of God's dealing with Israel is a continuous proof that He never confined Himself to one sacred spot but revealed Himself to patriarchs and prophets throughout the world in Mesopotamia, in Egypt and in the wilderness. This would emphasize the truth of what was declared by Solomon that the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands, and that as the teaching of Jesus implied true worship was not bound up with the continuance of the Temple. (2) That Israel had been disobedient from the days of Moses and had treated both the Lawgiver and his Laws with equal contempt. How therefore could Stephen's opponents affect a zeal for the Law which they and their fathers had continually disobeyed? The betrayal and murder of Jesus (the Righteous man) was only in keeping with the entire history of an apostate nation. It has been declared by many that this line of argument is a masterly one, and most orthodox commentators have maintained that the speech of Stephen had a powerful effect on the doctrine of the Apostle Paul, who heard it and received an indelible impression from the words of the first martyr. Both these statements, however, the appropriateness of the speech to the occasion on which it was delivered, and its effect on the mind of St. Paul are open to question.

Stephen is supposed to be addressing the supreme court of Israel presided over by the High Priest. Everyone of his audience was thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures and had no need to be reminded of the history of the nation. The object of the accused must have been to prove that neither he nor his Master before him had blasphemed the Temple or the Law. Instead of taking this line of defence Stephen is represented as giving a summary of the patriarchal history with which everyone of his auditors was thoroughly familiar, and continuing with an account of the disobedience of their forefathers, which had long been the theme of psalm and prophecy. Unlike the prophets of old Stephen neither calls for repentance nor holds out any prospect of forgiveness, but concludes with a violent denunciation of the sins of Israel from the time of Moses to his own day.

It seems that such a speech is neither relevant to the occasion, nor in accordance either with what we are told of Jesus nor with the preaching of His Gospel as represented elsewhere in Acts. Nor is there anything in Stephen's words similar to the teaching of St. Paul as reported in Acts or found in the epistles. The synagogue sermon (Acts 13) in which the apostle recapitulates the history of Israel is not in point. In the first place it was addressed to a mixed audience of Jews and gentiles in a remote town; and in the second its historical retrospect leads up to a declaration that Jesus is the Christ, a salvation which cannot be found in the Law is offered.

Another noticeable point is that in the entire speech of Stephen the name of Jesus is never mentioned and there is no allusion to a Messiah. The "Apology" socalled appears to be neither a defence of the faith nor even a Christian address but a general denunciation of the sins of Israel applicable to any period of its history.

Nor would the narrative of Acts suffer if the speech were omitted altogether. Without it the account runs perfectly smoothly

6. 8 Now Stephen, who was full of grace and power, performed great
9 wonders and miracles among the people. Some of those who
belonged to the socalled synagogue of the Libyans, The Cyrenians,
and the Alexandrians, as well as to that of the Cilicians and Asiatics,
10 started a dispute with Stephen, but they could not meet the wisdom
11 and the Spirit with which he spoke. They then instigated the
people to say, ‘We have heard him talking blasphemy against
Moses and God.’

12 In this way they excited the people, the elders, and the scribes,
who rushed on him, dragged him away, and took him before the
Sanhedrin.

13 They also brought forward false witnesses to say, ‘This fellow
14 is never done talking against this Holy Place and the Law.’ Why,
we have heard him say that Jesus the Nazarene will destroy this
Place and change the customs handed down to us by Moses!’

15 Then all who were seated in the Sanhedrin fixed their eyes on
7. 55 him, and saw that his face shone like the face of an angel. And he,
full of the holy Spirit, gazed up at heaven and saw the glory of
56 God and Jesus standing at God’s right hand. ‘Look,’ he said,
“I see heaven open and the Son of man standing at God’s right
hand!”

57 With a loud shriek they shut their ears and rushed at him like
58 one man. Putting him outside the city, they proceeded to stone
him (the witnesses laid their clothes at the feet of a youth called
Saul).

59 So they stoned Stephen, who called on the Lord, saying, ‘Lord
Jesus, receive my spirit!’ Then he knelt down and cried aloud,
60 ‘Lord, let not this sin stand against them!’ With these words he
slept the sleep of death. (Dr. Moffatt’s translation)

The omission of the speech brings out the intentional parallelism between the trial of Jesus and of His protomartyr and we cannot fail to notice how closely the two narratives correspond. The accusation of the false witnesses regarding the Temple is identical. Stephen saw “The Son of Man standing at God’s right hand” and Jesus declared that His judges will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power (Mark 14 62, Matt 26 64, Luke 22 69, Acts 7 56), Stephen prays Lord Jesus receive my Spirit (Acts 7 59), and Jesus commends his soul to the Father (Luke 23 46). Both pray for their murderers (Luke 23 34, Acts 7 60). The insertion of the speech certainly detracts from the impressive character of the description of the death of Stephen, and Stephen's words contrast unfavourably with the dignified silence of the Christ before the High Priest.

If this bold omission is permissible, it remains to propound a theory how the Apology of Stephen came to be inserted by the author of Acts. It has already been remarked that its tone is that of the Old Testament. We are reminded by it of Psalm 77 (Give ear O my people to my Law) and of Psalms 105 (O Give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his name), and 106, especially vv. 13—43. Is it possible that Luke took some old prophecy denouncing the sins of Israel and put it into the mouth of Stephen as, in his opinion suitable to the occasion? We are irresistibly reminded of the Magnificat which the evangelist attributes to the Blessed Virgin, or perhaps to Elizabeth. In it we have a thoroughly Old Testament ode based on the prayer of Hannah (1. Samuel 2 1—10) and the same may be perhaps said of the Benedictus of Zacharias (Luke 1 68—79).

We have a later example of a similar literary device. The Apology of Aristides was recovered in a Syriac translation by Rendel Harris and shortly afterwards Dr. Armitage Robinson found that the original Greek had been inserted as the speech of the soothsayer Barlaam in the comparatively well known Acts of Barlaam and Josaphat.

COMMUNICATION

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE NUMBERS IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF O. T.

SALO BARON
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

I became interested in the problem of the numbers in the First Prophets and the Book of Chronicles only incidentally while collecting material for a study on the "Israelitish Population in the Period of the Kings." My extensive essay on the subject, written in Hebrew, has been for a long time in the hands of the editors of the H. P. Chajes Memorial Volume in Vienna, but has not yet appeared in print. I accepted, therefore, with pleasure, the invitation of the editors of this Journal to publish the short communication which I had submitted to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at its last annual convention, concerning the results of my investigations on the numbers treated, in detail, in the first chapter of that essay.

In my study of the population problems I was facing the difficulty that, with a few exceptions, no external evidence was available and that I had to rely for most figures upon the authority of the Biblical statements. Two questions necessarily arose: 1) how far are the numbers found in the historical books of O. T. authentic, which means how far can we regard the figures given in our texts as rendering those in the original sources, and 2) provided even that they are authentic, how reliable are they, or how well informed were the authors of those sources from which the redactors of the Biblical books have derived their information. The answer to the second problem could be given only after an investigation—at least as far as pertinent to our question—of the general social and economic conditions of the country, a brief discussion of which I give in the second chapter of my essay.

In order to find a solution for the first question I collected all the Biblical references to numbers in the historical books of O. T. indicative of the one or the other aspect of the population problem in the period of the Kings. I took into account only the numbers concerning the population as such, the army, unvoluntary and voluntary labor, cities, families etc.; occasionally I also included the figures on sacrifices or on the amount of taxes etc., because they too may give important indications as to the number of the inhabitants. On the other hand, numbers concerning dates, such as the years of the reign of a certain king or the days of a month of a certain event, as well as those concerning measurements, for instance in the construction of the Temple, from which no deduction regarding population can be made, I omitted altogether. Also when the figures became rather a denomination for a group as in the case of the three or the thirty heroes of David, I mentioned only one instance as particularly remarkable.

With all these limitations I assembled not less than 340 verses containing numbers, some of them containing indeed more than one number. Then I tried to establish the existing variants in either the Hebrew manuscripts or the Greek, Syriac, Latin or Aramaic versions as well as in the occasional references of Josephus. As to the Hebrew manuscripts I used as a basis Kennicott with the few additions to be found in the editions of Ginsburg, Beer and Kittel, the latter being very incomplete in this regard. Only when among the several hundreds of manuscripts and editions which were in front of Kennicott there was one single Hebrew text differing from the Massorah, I disregarded it. Usually it was a simple lapsus of the copyist.

The result was truly astonishing. Out of the 340 verses 260 had no variants whatsoever. Of the remaining 60 verses only 7 had variants in Hebrew manuscripts, 1 in Aquila, 8 in Syr., 5 in V, 7 in Jos., while the vast majority, namely 52, had variants in LXX. The following list will give these results more in detail:

	Total number of verses	*Variae lectiones*							*No variants*
		H. Mss.	*LXX.*	*Aq.*	*Syr.*	*V.*	*T.*	*Jos.*	
Jos.	46	1	10	—	1	—	—	—	34
Jud......	52	1	4	1	2	2	—	—	46
I Sam....	25	1	10	—	2	1	—	5	14
II Sam. .	19	1	5	—	—	2	—	—	13
I K......	22	—	8	—	1	—	—	1	13
II K. ...	20	—	5	—	1	—	—	—	15
I Chr. ...	105	1	5	—	1	—	—	—	99
II Chr. ..	51	2	5	—	—	—	—	1	46
	340	7	52	1	8	5	—	7	280

This result is even more remarkable, if we take into consideration the well-known fact that copyists are more likely to make errors in numbers than in words of any other kind. Indeed, the every-day experience shows us that a dictation is often distorted by the hearer in regard to numbers, that a repetition of a number from memory is usually the least exact of all and, what is most important, a different number usually does not change the meaning of the sentence. Therefore, as a rule, neither the copyist nor the corrector are struck by the incongruency of the meaning when a number had been changed as they are when any other word is substituted. This experience is particularly common among classical philologians in their investigations of many comparatively young copies of ancient sources.

Nonetheless here, I repeat, in only seven out of 340 there are variations in the Hebrew manuscripts and editions themselves. Moreover, only one verse shows variants in six manuscripts and editions while the other verses show differences in only 2—4 texts out of several hundred. Such a power did the sacred character of the Scriptures exert on the minds of the copyists throughout the ages!

Of the different versions we have seen that T. has no variants whatever, as compared with the massoretic text. Aq. the other Jewish rabbinic version has only one, Syr. 8 and V. 5 variae lectiones. Josephus, who speaks merely of certain facts in their historical connection and frequently has the opportunity to mention one or another figure recorded in the Bible, differs from O. T. only in seven instances.

The chief number of variants is to be found, as we have seen, in LXX. But even here in 4 out of the 52 verses the variants appear only in Lucian representing, as well known, the least reliable text of the LXX, while both codices A and B agree with M. In 25 other cases either A or B agree with M. Indeed in 6 of those 29 verses the reason for the variant is none other than the omission of a whole part of a sentence by virtue of a homoioteleuton. Thus there remain only 23 verses in which LXX really differs from M.

In my essay I went through all the verses in which there are variants of any kind and I saw that in most cases a more or less obvious tendency of the translator was responsible for the change and not a different reading in his own source. Only in the three verses in which LXX changes the massoretic 30 into 70 as well as in the two verses where M reads 80, while LXX has only 50 there seems to be essentially a mistake of the copyist. In many instances it can be shown that the translator consciously changed the reading on account of certain difficulties which appeared to him in the massoretic text.

Another curious result of these investigations is that we find the largest number of variants in I Sam. and I K. and the smallest in Jud. and Chr. Particularly this latter point is very important, because it appears, at least at the first glance, that the Greek translators treated with more reverence the text of Chr. than that of Sam. and K. If this should be explained by the progress of the canonization of the Scriptures during the 2. century B. C., so that in the decades which elapsed between the translation of the First Prophets and that of Chr. the attitude of the translators to the received text became more conservative, we find an even more striking phenomenon: In six cases where there are differences in numbers between Sam. and K. on one hand and Chr. on the other, LXX steadily gives preference to the reading of Chr. and corrects accordingly the texts in the Prophets. Thus the translators of the latter around 200 B. C., already regarded Chr. as a highly canonical source, if we shall not accept the less probable assumption that both LXX and Chr. derived their figures from a common source. Of course, these few indications are not sufficient to prove anything by themselves, but, added to a line of similar arguments, they may prove to be of assistance in the discussion on the problem of Chr. on which a certain reorientation seems to be necessary for many reasons.

The most important result for me, however, was, that at least from the beginning of the Era on the numbers Christran given in the massoretic text, have undergone practically no changes at the hands of the copyists, and that even for centuries before they were more or less uniform, corresponding to those in our received texts. Moreover it happens that just those figures which are of primary importance for the population problems show a still smaller proportion of variants than that indicated in our general list.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS DRAMATIC MATERIAL

CLAYTON R. BOWEN
MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

AMONG the questions raised by any consideration of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, none is more important, and none is more neglected, than the question: To what type of literary composition does it belong? Because in our Bibles it is labelled "gospel" and follows three other documents similarly labelled, it has almost universally been taken for granted that it is a document of essentially the same type as these three predecessors, i. e., a setting forth of the work and message of Jesus in narrative form. On the surface, of course, it seems to be that, and few have cared here to look much below the surface, however detailed have been investigations into other aspects of the gospel.

After the prologue, the Fourth Gospel begins with some presentation of John Baptist, as does every other primitive account of Jesus known to us, and goes on with a picture of Jesus teaching, healing, winning disciples, moving about in Galilee and Judea, drawing the increasing opposition of the Jewish ecclesiastical leaders, finally arrested in Jerusalem on the eve of the Passover, crucified under Pontius Pilate on Golgatha, only to rise from the grave and appear to chosen friends a few days later. Closer comparison with the synoptic narrative shows, of course, that apart from this general likeness in large outline, likeness in detail is almost entirely lacking. There is an opening section on John the Baptist, and a considerable closing section on the Passion with its preliminaries and its sequel; between these termini there are two, possibly three, wonder-stories with synoptic parallels. Aside from these four (or five) points, the material presented by the fourth evangelist is wholly new; and, what is even more striking, within precisely these four (or five) coincidental sections the variations in detail are far more striking than even the large discrepance in the bulk of the material. All this is of common knowledge, though seldom given its full force.

And not here lies the real divergence of the Johannine Gospel from its predecessors. That real divergence lies in the fact that *in no sense is the Fourth Gospel in form a narrative at all.* The others are; homiletic or edifying narrative, to be sure; a narrative not always of quite literal fact, no doubt, but in form and composition a genuine narrative. Whatever process of "redaction" (word beloved of critics today) took place, in the end the product is a story written or composed straight ahead, in some sort of purposed sequence. Now, the Fourth Gospel cannot possibly be written straight ahead as a narrative. The simple recognition of this fact would save many a futile attempt at "interpretation" of its sequence. It is *not a narrative.*

I do not mean that it is not a narrative of fact; I am not now concerned with the historicity of its content. Everything stated there may have literally happened just so, or every detail may be a purely fictitious creation of the author's fancy; in either case the fact or the fancy is not presented as a narrative. It is not a narrative any more than Hamlet or the Song of Solomon or Faust is a narrative. What it tells it does not tell as items in a story; its succession has no relation to the sequences of a life-experience or the development of a plot. As Professor Bacon says,[1] "There is neither order nor connection, nor do events entail their consequences." There is throughout no progress of event or conception, no change of attitude, no perspective. Material in one chapter might quite as well (and very often much better!) stand in another, and a wholesale rearrangement of sequences is the first temptation that assails every student. What stands near the end would be as much

[1] Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, 1910, p. 12.

in place near the beginning, and *vice versa.* Indeed, much that we are instinctively sure belongs near the end stands near the beginning. In the first chapter (vs. 41) Simon Peter is converted, before he has ever seen or heard of Jesus, by the bald declaration of his brother Andrew, "We have found the Messiah!" And in the second chapter, the second deed recorded in Jesus' career is that cleansing of the temple which this writer knows quite as well as the synoptic writers or ourselves was the prelude to the crucifixion. Much more of this sort of thing might, of course, be pointed out.

Similar observations could be made in regard to the language of the speeches of the gospel. The chief characters all speak alike; only if the speaker is directly named can the speech be assigned to Jesus rather than to John the Baptist, and where the discourse of either is replaced by that of the evangelist it is at times wholly impossible to say. Who says the great words of 3 16, "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life"? Who says, "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life, but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him"? (3 35f.) We cannot tell.

Is it narrative for concrete episodes to fade out into homiletic monologue as does the Nicodemus dialogue? Can we call the following sequence narrative? "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life, but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. When *therefore* the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John," etc. (3 36–4 1.) Or this, beginning with words spoken in Jerusalem, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words? After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee" (5 46–6 1)? We must not forget that our chapter divisions, which obscure these abrupt *lacunae* from the average reader, are no part of the text, but are a modern device for introducing something like analysis into an incoherent flow of material.

Can this have been a planned sequence, "Those of the Pharisees who were with him heard these things and said unto him, Are we also blind? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye would have no sin, but now ye say, We see, your sin remaineth. Verily, verily I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the fold of the sheep, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep," etc. (9 40–10 1)? Or this, from the scene after the last supper, where, in answer to Peter's protest of undying loyalty, Jesus says, "Wilt thou lay down thy life for me? Verily, verily I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice. Let not your heart be troubled," etc. (13 38–14 1)?

There are plenty of other illustrations of the same thing. It is obvious that the material is not current narrative, running on in some connected and progressive sequence, but a series of independent blocks, arranged now in an order often quite accidental and meaningless, an order which, quite certainly, had the author been able to complete his work for publication, would have been completely recast in accordance with some rational scheme. At present the whole is immobile, static, raw, inorganic material. Commentators have frequently likened it to the flat surface of a painting, as compared with the plastic scenes of the synoptics, which have contour, relief, light and shade, the three dimensions of *sculpture*, as of external reality. Baldensperger[2] spoke of the Gospel as having "die Fixität . . eines Frescogemäldes." I heard Harnack make the same observation in lectures in Berlin in 1902, and I note it not infrequently in the more recent books.

Another form of art, then, from the synoptic gospels. They are sculpture, this is fresco-painting; they are narrative, this is—what? My answer is: drama. Not, let me hasten to say, completed, constructed drama; that would quite contradict all the observations we have made as to the lack of any action, plot, or culmination. I mean only, a miscellany of material conceived dramatically, passages, dialogue, monologue, sketches of setting, of characters, of exits and entrances, of time and place and such like.

[2] *Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums,* 1898, p. 118, note 1.

Elsewhere I have set forth my impression that the Fourth Gospel is a collection of material not edited by its author into final shape for publication.[3] My point now is that this material was conceived not as narrative, not as parallel in any way to the synoptic writings, but as a series of dramatic scenes. It is not to be read, but to be seen and heard. Its men and women are not characters in a story, but persons of a play; they are, therefore, not rounded out into all the multifarious humanity of real men and women; each is a symbol, is the embodiment of an idea; beyond that he has no existence; other sides of his personality are simply not sketched or even hinted. Is it not so? Is not the whole of this great material conceived thus to present ideas? Is it not a set of dramatic symbols?

The thesis presented might be argued in great detail from the way the persons are sketched, from the way they appear and disappear, from the *way* they speak and the actual *lines* they speak, from the illuminating observation, which once stated, it is hard not to share, that they are, one and all, just masks, just *per-sonae*, through which sounds the message of the dramatist. From many other points of view the same thing might be argued: from the time and place references, from the abruptness of transitions from scene to scene, from the even more abrupt closing of scenes, as by the swift descent of a curtain, in mid-speech and mid-action, from the part played by action as itself the symbol of profound meanings, and that played by dialogue and monologue, from the fact, indeed, that the gospel is here a spoken gospel, a gospel of the public utterance—"these things have I spoken unto you" is the chief person's own summary (seven times repeated) of his part—marked by a quite extraordinary use of words designating *speech*. Each of these and of many other lines might be profitably followed, and shall be, I hope, on occasion. I want now, however, simply to make the general point.

It may be well at this juncture to state that I claim no great merit of originality for my proposal of this way of reading the gospel. The word "dramatic" is a frequent one in any treatment of "John." There is R. H. Strachan's book, The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian? (1925), but it hardly goes beyond a general statement like "the Gospel is conceived in dramatic form," which has reference chiefly to the contrasts of Light and Darkness, Life and Death, Belief and Unbelief, which so clearly mark its pages. B. W. Robinson, in his excellent treatise (The Gospel of John, 1925) goes a little farther in his perception of the fact that "John throws what he has to say into the form of dramatic dialogue again and again" (p. 150), but the general impression made upon Robinson by the material is of notes, not carefully edited, of popular conversational homily. In the little book of Herbert and Carl Purinton, Literature of the New Testament (1925) there is a chapter (25) which gives a dramatic arrangement of the Gospel in five acts, with prologue and epilogue, which is suggestive as far as it goes, but is lacking in any discussion of detail. In the fifth chapter of Lord Charnwood's book, in the midst of a strenuous insistence upon the historical character of the work and its authorship by the eyewitness apostle, there comes to expression the literary man's perception of the dramatic conception of the whole. "One man has very often written as drama what another had written or told as a history or tale. Shakespeare and all the Greek tragedians did this, and I must ask later whether something analogous has not happened here" (p. 62). "This fact by itself need not trouble us much; even in a literal drama about history, the question of its worth as history depends upon the attitude of the dramatist to the event and the fulness of his probable knowledge" (p. 68). "This is a work of very elaborate and very conscious art . . . It may be compared to a great drama, though the comparison need not be pressed too hard. In a way, it reminds one of a great piece of music" (p. 61). But beyond such general suggestions Lord Charnwood does not go. In his judgment, I suppose, my own more definite proposals would be pressing the comparison too hard.

---

[3] C. R. Bowen: Comments on the Fourth Gospel, *Anglican Theological Review*, January, 1930.

In any case, the justification for the view suggested must be found in the measure in which the actual material of the Gospel fits into it. General considerations aside, we must "try it on." In attempting any outline of the Gospel on the assumption that it is essentially dramatic, we must bear in mind that the proposal involves the conviction that the material was not, prior to publication, edited into final and well-ordered shape. It is a collection of stuff for a book, rather than a book quite written out. That not every passage will fit smoothly into the dramatic scheme is obvious; no less so that at times we shall seem to be doing violence to our material. But we must bear with that, until we ascertain whether the general idea has any real foothold in the text before us. In what follows, there is only an attempt, purposely very tentative and very loose, to see how far the first three chapters lend themselves to the dramatic hypothesis. This may be a sufficient sample from which students may judge whether the idea is fallacious, or is worth following up.

To begin with, there is that remarkable initial passage of eighteen verses, to which scholarship has inevitably, without a dissenting voice, given the title *Prologue.* Prologue: the word suggests the preface to a play; just as clearly the verses themselves suggest a striking of the great major chords whose harmony is to vibrate until the last curtain falls. The Prologue raises a thousand questions of text and interpretation; it needs, and has, a whole literature of its own. But that it *is* a Prologue, the overture to a drama, not the first chapter in a biographical narrative, is here our main concern. We may, if we will, consider it spoken by the Evangelist, before the curtain rises on the action. Its first words are ἐν ἀρχῇ; its last, appropriately enough, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. The latter word belongs to the vocabulary of drama; it describes the symbolic action by which the mystagogue sets forth to the candidates the hidden meanings of the cult as represented in the mystery-spectacles. The verb is aorist, ἐξηγήσατο; not "hath declared him," as our English translation has it (A. V., R. V. and Am. R. V.), but: "played the rôle, acted it out", with no pronoun object. The meaning is, "in the following drama performed the revealing action."

The first scene of the dramatic material itself is prior to the appearance of Jesus at all. As it stands it is 1 19–28. It is captioned, "The witness of John." The curtain rises on a setting not described, at a time not indicated, at a place identified only in an appended note at the end (vs. 28) as Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. If this seems an awkward place for the stage-direction, we may think of it as a note set down provisionally there, to be worked more correctly into the dramatic structure in the final writing. We find such stage-directions, i. e., notes of time and place and circumstances, set down apparently wherever they happened to occur to the dramatist, often, as here, at the end, often at the beginning or intruding awkwardly into the midst of the action or dialogue. On the stage in this first scene (it would be extraordinarily easy to play it now) we see first of all the figure of John (we call him the Baptist, remembering the Synoptics, but the fourth Evangelist never uses this epithet). Any description of his person, dress, bearing, we must also furnish for ourselves from our synoptic memories; none is here given.[4] There he stands, dominating the stage. At one side stands a little group of characteristic Jewish ecclesiastics, priests and Levites, the committee of delegates from Jerusalem. Their costume and general appearance is easily supplied; it is not here described. The scene is but a brief dialogue. Who art thou? I am not the Christ, and the rest of it. The curtain falls on John's words, "whose shoelatchet I am not worthy to unloose."

There is a lapse of twenty-four hours between this scene and the next, duly stated. The curtain rises on the same setting as in scene one. The Jerusalem committee has disappeared, but John stands there as before, looking off stage into the wings. We follow where his eyes are fixed, and see, as he sees, the figure of Jesus (undescribed) walking slowly, majestically, on to the stage toward John. It is his first appearance. He does not speak, but as he comes, John breaks the silence. ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, with the extended hand

---

[4] It is a very common procedure of "John" thus to assume behind his scenes, setting and background given by the synoptic writers, but nowhere by himself. The classic instance is, of course, 3 24, "for John was not yet cast into prison," the only reference in his pages to the Baptist's imprisonment. In the opening scenes of chapter one, the setting—a level place on Jordan's banks—is thus to be supplied; this would automatically be done by every reader familiar with the earlier accounts.

and pointing finger which go with ἴδε. As the solemn words of his testimony die away, "this is the Son of God", the curtain falls on the scene, so impressive in its simplicity.

Again twenty-four hours elapse; again the same setting meets our eyes as the curtain lifts. Again John stands there expectantly, this time with two of his disciples (undescribed) beside him. Again appears the figure of Jesus, walking onto the stage; again the pointing hand and the testimony ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Now Jesus, striding in solemn silence by, has passed John and his two companions. The latter, at their master's words, turn and begin to follow Jesus as he walks toward the far end of the stage. A moment the three walk silently thus, leaving John a deserted and eloquently wistful figure where he stood. Then Jesus turns and speaks—his first words in the Gospel—and very full of import they are meant to be. τί ζητεῖτε, what are you looking for? That is the point. All these people who came as seekers to the Christian Church, what were they looking for? Probably they do not all clearly know; but they are drawn to seek some companionship with Jesus, the Christians' master. In his presence their need and his ability to supply it will alike become clearer. This tiny dialogue is profoundly suggestive. What is it that you seek? Rabbi (i. e. Teacher, for it is a teaching on the dark problems of life and destiny that in the *evangelist's* view is at once what men most need and what Christ has to give), Teacher, where do you dwell? Come and see. That is all. Implicitly, of course, the words convey: We would come to your home with you. Come along. So they come. We see the three go out together, and as the curtain falls the dramatist tells us what we scarcely need to be told: they not merely saw where he dwelt, they went in with him and remained the rest of that day. Curious is the note of time: it was about four P. M., in itself a dramatic item, and doubtless of a symbolic import into which we cannot here further inquire.

Verses 40–42 give the impression of being a part of the section which began with vs. 35, relating, as they do, the subsequent action of Andrew, expressly identified as one of the two who had gone to Jesus' abode. And the τῇ ἐπαύριον, which is at this point the clear mark of transition to a new scene, does not come until vs. 43. Yet the episode of the bringing of Simon to Jesus by his brother is not worked up into full drama-form like the context, into which it fits with some awkwardness. It is chronologically difficult, between "that day" and "the morrow". Such passages are undeniably a difficulty for any theory of the Gospel as a well-ordered drama, but they are precisely the data on which the suggestion is based that we have a collection of material, conceived as stuff for dramatic use, but only partly edited and worked up into final form. They represent data between scenes already written up, themselves as yet only notes. There are, of course, many such.

1 43–51 is, however, a single and unified dramatic scene like the two with which the Gospel began. It begins like its immediate predecessors with the τῇ ἐπαύριον, the lapse of twenty-four hours. Its named characters, besides Jesus, are Peter, Philip and Nathanael. Doubtless Andrew also, were the stage-directions complete, would be there standing behind his Master; probably also his anonymous colleague, who with him had left John for Jesus. In that case the group of disciples with Jesus would be five: the one unnamed, Andrew, Peter, Philip and Nathanael. We should probably act the scene most effectively as follows. As the curtain rose, Jesus would be seen standing toward one end of the stage, accompanied by the two followers who had stayed with him during the closing hours of the preceding day. Enter Simon Peter (for he is surely intended as the subject of the verbs in vs. 43, who had a mind to return to Galilee and first found his fellow townsman Philip)[5]. Enter Simon Peter with Philip, whom he has "found" as he himself had been "found" by Andrew. There is a brief presentation; Jesus says only: Follow me, and Philip is an apostle. Now for the first time we become aware that the other end of the stage, or the background, has been gradually filling with a somewhat numerous company of miscellaneous folk, a kind of chorus or audience, thought of as not of Jesus' following. To this group Philip steps, and singling out one man (his name is given as Nathanael) among them, he declares, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the pro-

---

[5] Cf. C. R. Bowen, in *JBL*, XLIII (1924), pp. 25f.

phets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph! Can anything good come out of Nazareth? asks Nathanael in surprise. Come and see, replies Philip, as Jesus had replied to Andrew and his friend the day before. So out from the crowd, across the stage to where Jesus and his three disciples stand waiting, comes Nathanael, led by Philip. As they approach, Jesus fixes his eyes on Nathanael and says, Behold an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile. The rest of the dialogue we know so well, closing as it does so abruptly with the reference to the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. As these words fall from Jesus' lips, the curtain drops; the scene is over.

Four such scenes have passed before us, on four successive days. Jesus has appeared, has won five disciples and is now about to start with them for Galilee. We are not surprised, therefore, that when the curtain rises on the next scene we are in Galilee. In a narrative some formula of transition, suggesting the journey, would have been in place; in a succession of dramatic scenes it is, of course, unnecessary. There is a lapse this time of three days; this scene, therefore, marks the end of the first week in the action of the drama, a point clearly intended by the dramatist, of a significance we cannot now stop to determine.

The rise of the curtain reveals a brilliant scene, the gayety and color of a Palestinian wedding feast. The setting would readily be visualized by any ancient reader. In any case the *occasion* is not significant nor in any way stressed. Any other festival would have done as well. At no point is any use made of the symbolism of the marriage; the bride is not even mentioned, and though a line is addressed to the bridegroom at the end, he does not respond, and is addressed merely in his quality as host. It is the *guests* who are important; there is a wedding only to furnish the occasion for the act. Particularly is one guest important; for his sake are the bride and groom eclipsed. The persons of the scene in the order of their appearance are given as the mother of Jesus (how strange that her name Mary is never mentioned by this evangelist!—a point overlooked by many eminent expounders)—the mother of Jesus, then Jesus himself, then his disciples. How many of the latter? Since the material is not yet arranged in proper chronological sequence, we have no reason for limiting the number to the five won in the first chapter. Nor have we any compelling reason against such limitation. But when we meet "his disciples", with no differentiation, as here, my feeling is that the traditional group of twelve was in the writer's mind. At one side of the room stand the six great stone water pots and all about bustle the busy servants bringing food and drink to the festive guests. The action is familiar. The mother speaks twice, once to her Son, once to the servants. Jesus speaks thrice, once to his mother, twice to the servants. The only other speech is the attestation given by the ruler of the feast to the excellence of the miraculous wine. Six brief speeches, a minimum of action; was ever so impressive drama set forth with such economy of effects? But all the more is it evident from the very structure and stark simplicity of the scene, that what we have *is* drama, and by no possibility narrative.

Verse 11 is the evangelist's comment on his scene and its result on those who first witnessed it. This latter, of course, is meant to suggest what should be its effect on those who read or hear or witness it in his presentation. After the transitional comment of verse 12, a new scene is offered in verses 13–22, the famous "cleansing of the temple." Its position here at the opening of Jesus' mission has always been a difficulty for readers who knew their Synoptics. We may well doubt if the author meant to imply that the episode took place thus early. But it was one of the scenes which he had well in mind and had written among the first, so that it is found near the front of his mass of notes. Had he really been able to write out his work in final form he might perhaps have placed it where it belongs, as do the Synoptics. But in view of the way the succeeding context is linked to it for a considerable distance ahead, this seems to me far from certain. The scene itself is dramatic enough, and there are some properties not found in the synoptic parallel, notably the scourge of small cords. So the dialogue is new; but how brief—two speeches of Jesus and two of "the Jews." Yet we feel no brevity or inadequacy; we are conscious that a big scene with farreaching significance has been played before us.

Verse 22 is again the author's comment on the disciples' reaction to this scene, and as before, is meant as suggestion for the reaction of the reader.

Stephen Langton (if it was he) certainly blundered here when he cut up the New Testament into chapters seven hundred odd years ago. The third chapter should begin with 2 23, which, with the two following verses, is an inseparable part of the Nicodemus scene which ends with 3 21. The verses read like the author's sketch or summary of the content and meaning of the scene which follows. Nicodemus is chosen as the type and illustration of the many in Jerusalem who "believed" on the evidence of "signs" which Jesus was doing, without being such believers as could in the end be relied upon, men whose lack of fundamental conviction lay open to the complete psychological insight of Jesus. The scene itself is a dialogue, soon passing into a monologue. The costume and bearing of Nicodemus are sufficiently indicated by the one descriptive phrase *ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων*; the nocturnal setting by the one word *νυκτός*; the place is any room in Jerusalem. In the light of the flickering lamp two figures are seen upon the stage, each clearly characterized and recognizable. Nicodemus has the opening speech, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God" and the rest. The reply of Jesus here, as is usual in this Gospel, takes no account of the other's words, but states in clear blunt fashion his own thesis for the interview. "Except one be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Two more sentences Nicodemus speaks, both interrogative, both incredulous. And with that Nicodemus' part is played; he has served his purpose, has given the cue for Jesus' pronouncement. He now simply vanishes from the scene. Certainly after verse 12 there is no longer any pretence that he is present as the auditor to whom Jesus' words are directed. Those words go on without reference to him or to the query which brought him on his nocturnal quest. Each of the two persons of this scene thus speaks three times, the last speech of Jesus soon becoming a monologue addressed to the audience. In the midst of this monologue, the curtain abruptly falls (vs. 21).

The next scene (3 22–36) is in its composition much the same as the preceding. Its first verses (22–25) are the author's summary of the setting and occasion of the scene, such information as is vitally necessary to our understanding of action and speeches. The dialogue, if such it may be called, is again of the simplest and most impressive sort. Followers of the Baptist, jealous for his reputation, come with a complaint about the superior vogue of Jesus, to which the Baptist himself responds in ten verses, on the last of which the curtain descends, cutting off the lines with abrupt finality.

Thus the material of three chapters of our present Gospel has been briefly surveyed from the point of view of the suggested theory. It is clear that we have here no technically well-wrought drama. But it is equally clear that we have still less a well-wrought narrative. What we have is an imperfectly edited collection of material, only partially worked into the form it is meant to exhibit. But what that form was to be is, I submit, obvious. It was to be a dramatic sequence, in many particulars not unlike what we today call a pageant.

A NOTE ON GENESIS 5 29

JULIAN MORGENSTERN
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

IN *JBL* 1929, p. 138f Professor E. G. Kraeling discussed the interpretation of the name Noah in Gen. 5 29. By way of indicating the interest which this article held for me I should like to comment briefly upon it and perhaps to supplement its thought in one or two particulars. Professor Kraeling refers incidentally to Goldziher's article „Zur Geschichte der Etymologie des Namens נח“ (*ZDMG*, XXIV, 1870, p. 207f) in support of his contention that the ינחמנו of the present text does not fit the name נח. Now Goldziher, quoting Abraham Bakrat's supercommentary on Rashi to Gen. 5 29 says that the word ינחמנו there used would have indicated that the name of the hero of the flood was not נח but מנחם, had Lemech in his day only known of this name; but since the name Menahem was unknown in his day, of course the word ינחמנו must be explained in conjunction with the name Noah. This is indeed suggestive. Of course neither Rashi nor Abraham Bakrat knew anything of modern Biblical Science; and if they had, they would of course have rejected its conclusions completely. But modern Biblical Science has established quite conclusively that the J strata of Gen. 1—11 are not of great antiquity, and in all likelihood come from the early post-exilic period. Unquestionably the universalistic spirit which animates them, as well as the Priestly stratum of this same section of Genesis, shows the direct influence of Deutero-Isaiah, or is at least the product of the same age, which called forth the universalistic outlook of both Deutero-Isaiah and of these chapters. Moreover this was an age in which Messianic ideas were widely current, and in which the name Menahem was certainly not unknown. Furthermore it is by no means improbable that Gen. 5 29b plus לאמר in 29a, in other words the suggested explanation of the name Noah, may not be original, but may be instead a gloss which crept into the original text in one manner or another. Unquestionably this gloss, as it reads in MT, explains, not the name Noah, but the name *Menahem*. And this seems to have been the reading of all the ancient versions except LXX. This last unquestionably read ינחנו, and this reading, of course, explains the name Noah.

Now undoubtedly Kraeling is correct in asserting that in popular tradition, and not improbably in its very origin in Israel, the figure of Noah was associated with the figure of the sun-god, or, perhaps more exactly, that Noah was regarded as a solar hero, and therefore endowed with solar attributes. Likewise his related assertion, that in the popular mind the legend of Noah in Israelite tradition preserved some of the details of the Akkadian original of the Biblical legend is equally correct. Proof of this may be seen in the statement of Enoch 88 9, that after the flood the white bull, i. e. Noah, departed from them. This last expression is peculiar indeed, and seems to me to preserve a direct reminiscence of the transition of the hero of the Akkadian flood legend to the Isles of the Blessed across the Waters of Death, where, instead of dying, he enjoyed immortality.

The author is undoubtedly correct also in his statement that the interpretation of the name Noah which Gen. 5 29b offers, viz. "This one will comfort us", suggests Messianic tradition. But, as we know from abundant evidence, solar tradition and Messianic tradition were intimately associated. Tradition endowed the expected Messiah with innumerable solar attributes. Now in Rabbinic literature Menahem appears quite frequently as the name of the Messiah, soon to be born. (Cf. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, III, 153f, under מנחם (3) for references.) Unquestionably the name and the tradition associated with it go back to pre-rabbinic, late Biblical times. There is good reason to believe that, in addition to the name Noah, the flood hero may have been known popularly, with reference to his Messianic character, also as Menahem. In fact just this is the implication of Enoch 107 3, which states explicitly that the hero of the flood received his name because "he will comfort the earth after all the destruction". Even though the name is called Noah in the first part of the verse, it is clear that this can in no sense be construed as an explanation of any name other than Menahem.

It seems to me therefore, that perhaps the solution of the problem that Gen. 5 29 in MT and all the versions other than LXX explains, not the name Noah, but the name Menahem is this: Gen. 5 29 b plus the obviously editorial לאמר (for which Pesh. read ויאמר), is a gloss which in some way crept into the originally simple text. Without this gloss the account of the birth of Noah reads much as does that of the other antediluvian patriarchs, and leads up of course to the P narrative of the flood beginning in 6 9. The very fact that 5 29 b is generally regarded as J, though in a characteristically P setting, stamps it emphatically as a gloss. The reasons for regarding this gloss as J are that it is certainly from a hand other than the original P author of this passage, the use of the name Yahwe and the reference to the J tradition recorded in Gen. 4. It is by no means impossible that the half-verse may actually be a fragment preserved from the conclusion of the J tradition which breaks off suddenly in 4 24. Unquestionably this was suppressed by later P writers or editors in favor of their somewhat divergent antediluvian and flood traditions. Not impossibly in the original J version, the hero of the flood story was called, not Noah, but Menahem. There would be no difficulty whatsoever in understanding that P editors had substitued their name Noah for the J Menahem even in the J fragments of the flood story which they have retained. But even if Menahem was not the name of the hero of the flood-story in the original J narrative, certainly it must have been his name in some of the popular versions of this story which circulated in the 4th, 3rd and 2nd pre-Christian centuries, and perhaps even a little earlier than that. And it is this name, and not Noah, which the gloss in Gen. 5 29 as well as Enoch 107 3 b explain.

However, after this gloss had crept into the text of Gen. 5 29, with, however, the suppression necessarily of the name Menahem, since the name Noah already stood there, it was self-evident that this offered no explanation of the name Noah. Accordingly, by the simple omission of the מ, in some manuscripts, the name was coordinated effectually with Noah. Such a ms. the LXX translators must have had before them. And even with this reinterpretation a certain Messianic implication survived in 5 29b; for ינחנו can well be interpreted as meaning "he will bring us מנוחה". And מנוחה occasionally has a Messianic implication, the condition of quiet, security, restfulness, etc. to come in the Messianic age. Thus in I Chron. 22 9aβ, a passage which itself seems to disturb the context and to be a Messianic gloss (שלמה יהיה שמו should follow directly upon הנה בן נולד לך) Solomon, both here and in II Sam. 7 endowed with Messianic qualities, is called איש מנוחה almost, it would seem, as if this was an explanation of the name Noah instead of referring to Solomon.

This occurs to me as a possible, and even probable explanation of the patent difficulty involved not only in Gen. 5 29 but also in Enoch 107 3.

THE YEAR-EPONYMATE IN THE HEBREW MONARCHY

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE office of the eponym who gave his name to the calendar year was ancient in Assyria. We possess lists of these *līmu*-officers, extending by exact chronology from 1103 to 648 B. C., while another list of 32 officials cannot be chronologically placed.[1] A similar officer existed in South Arabia, by title *kabīr*, over the year, *ḫrp*; on this more below. In the Mediterranean world many Greek states possessed similar officers, archons at Athens, *ephori* at Sparta, Delos, Delphi, etc.; the *strategos* in Achaia and Aetolia, etc.[2] In Rome the consuls gave their name to the year, the regulation of the calendar being invested in a solemn college of *pontifices*. For the Hebrew state Winckler has argued that there must have been a similar officialdom in charge of the institution of the new year, holding that traces of such official dating survive in the Hebrew Bible.[3] The present discussion would offer a demonstration of the existence of this eponymship in the early Hebrew monarchy.

---

[1] For these lists see Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria*, 2, 427ff.; for a more limited list, Schrader, *KB*, 1, 204ff.; cf. Sidney Smith, *Early History of Assyria*, 1928, Appendix on Chronology. A *līmu*-system was used in the ancient so-called Cappadocian tablets; see Smith, pp. 151ff. C. Brockelmann, "Wesen und Ursprung des Epynomats," *ZA* 16 (1906), 389—401, presents the earlier literature and pertinent discussions.

[2] See Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie*, *s. v.* "Kalender," vol. 10, 2.

[3] *KAT*^{3}, 322f.

The following comparative table presents the Hebrew text of the beginning of the list of Solomon's officers in 1 Ki. 4 2—3, and the two forms of early Greek text which parallel it. Column ii gives the revised Greek text (pre-Hexaplaric) as it stands in place agreeing with 𝕳 in c. 4; column iii the text appearing in the miscellany at end of 𝕲 2 46h (Swete, p. 678). The latter text is the earlier of the two, representing a condition of text which had not advanced to cover 3 Kingdoms, but which satisfied itself with a miscellany drawn from the subsequent history of Solomon. Column iv presents some glosses in the latter text which are to be considered.[4]

I 𝕳	II 𝕲 at 4 2—3	III 𝕲 at 2 46h	IV Glosses in 2 46h
עזריהו	Αζαρια	Αζαριου	
בן	υιος	υιος	
צדוק	Σαδωκ	Σαδωκ	
הכהן	— (Hex. ο ιερευς)	του ιερεως	επι της αυλαρχιας
אליחרף	και Ελιαφ	—	και επι του πλινθιου

𝕲 of col. iii here inserts two officers in different order from 𝕳: και Ορνειου υιος Ναθαν αρχων των εφεστηκοτων και Εδραμεν επι τον οικον αυτου

ואחיה	και Αχεια	—	
בני	υιος (XI, 11 MSS υιοι)	—	
שישא	Σαβα	και Σουβα	
ספרים	γραμματεις (3 MSS — τευς)	γραμματευς	

---

[4] The fullest discussion of this material and of the origins of the earliest Greek translations is given by Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," in *J. Th. St.*, June, 1907, 262—278; cf. his *Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (1923), 16ff. Hänel has presented a useful analysis of the Greek miscellanies in c. 2, "Die Zusätze der Septuaginta in 1 Reg. 2 5a—o und 46a—l" in *ZAW* 1929, 76—79, but without much positive result in the way of explanation of the rise of these miscellanies. The present writer holds that the Shimei episode, vv. 35l—46 also was part of the miscellany, its introduction being subsequently repeated in place agreeing with 𝕳 at 2 8—9 (Swete, pp. 677, 673). In this case the miscellany, itself a result of aggregation, extended from v. 35a to end of the chapter, and we may

Column iii continues with three officers which may be identified in 𝔊: *και Βασα υιος Αχειθαλαμ αναμιμνησκων και Αβει υιος Ιωαβ αρχιστρατηγος και Αχειρε υιος Εδραει*. There follow two evident glosses:

Gloss 1: *και Βαναια υιος Ιωδαε*, evident betterment of the patent corruption in the item above, *Αβει* (Lucian, *Ελιαβ*) *υιος Ιωαβ* (Lucianic 108 *Ιωαδ*), i. e. the soldier Benaiah b. Jehoiada; and

Gloss 2, which I have transferred to col. iv, for reasons to be discussed.

The following remarks may be made on the above texts.[5]

The text of col. ii ignores "the priest"—from objections to making an Azariah priest in place of the traditional Sadok? Col. iii expresses it wrongly by the genitive.

אליחרף is ignored in col. iii. It is an absolutely unintelligible name-formation; so most recently Nold, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, 237. Also it is not preceded by the conjunction as is the case with the rest of the list, except the following officer Jehoshaphat, but this name is preceded by a text-corruption, as we shall see.

Eliaph and Acheia of col. ii are followed by the singular *υιος*. A similar tradition survives for the plural ספרים in the singular reading of 3 MSS (56, Lucianic 93, 246 close congener of B), while col. iii knows of only one *γραμματευς*. There is thus ancient textual

---

suppose was inscribed on spare leaves of the book. And so the original translation continued 2 Kingdoms to 2 35 (inclusive), concluding dramatically with "the kingdom was established in Jerusalem." I regard the final item in v. 35 on Sadok the priest, which is quite out of place, as an insertion, entered subsequently from the later form of 𝔊, where also it was an insertion. Thus, in addition to the present division between 2 and 3 Kingdoms, and the Lucianic division which made the break after 2 11, we find here another, the earliest, distinction of the end of 2 Kingdoms.

[5] The text of the Lucianic MSS does not vary from the elder Greek except in proper names; it is fundamentally identical with that of B in the plus of 𝔊 in these miscellanies as elsewhere in Ki. See in general Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, Heft 3. N. b. the form *Αζαριου* in col. iii = עזריהו. This primitive name-form appears several times almost uniquely in B, e. g. *Αδωνειου*, nominative, 1 9, but it is generally turned into an inflected noun, e. g. *Αδωνειας*, 1 5.

evidence for but one royal Scribe and so for the ignoring of the unintelligible Elihoreph as a proper name. This is supported by the fact that elsewhere we learn of but one Scribe: 2 Ki. 12 11, 19 2, 22 3, Jer. 36 12. 20.

With this indictment of "Elihoreph" as a proper name, I considered whether it might not be otherwise interpreted. It occurred to me that it might be resolved into אל(י) חרֶף (= על (ה)חרף) "over the year," in parallel with the South-Arabic use of *ḫrp* employed for the official year.[6] There existed in South Arabia an ample official system of chronology by which the date of an inscription (and doubtless of the documents to which the monuments refer) was recorded as "in month X of *kbr* (kabirate) of Y," or "in month X of *ḫrp* (year) of Y *kabīr* (pontiff)."[7]

---

[6] In Biblical Hebrew חרף = "autumn." For the original meaning of the root, cf. Akk. *ḫarpu*, Arab. *ḫarīf*, see B. Landersberger's study in *Archiv f. Orientforschung*, 3 (1926), 164ff.; he argues for original root-meaning of "early." As the beginning of the ancient Semitic year the autumn was so designated, and as the fixation of the new year was the principal business of the calendar-officials, the word *ḫrp* was extended, as in South Arabia, to the whole year. Compare our development of "epoch" and "period" from a point to an extent of time. For the Babylonian astronomical dating, for composing the Ephemerides, from the autumn equinox, see Schnabel, *ZA* 3 (1927), 34ff., 40.

[7] Hartmann vocalizes as *kubr* and *ḫarp*, as verbal nouns, as against the Arabic vocalization *ḫarīf*, usually adopted. See the survey of the terminology in his *Arabische Frage* (vol. 2, 1909, of his *Der Islamische Orient*), 442ff. This kabirate also existed in the Minaean settlement at el-Ula in NW Arabia, now known to be the Biblical Dedan; several inscriptions are dated in the term, or month, of *kabīr* X. See Jaussen and Savignac, *Mission archéologique*, vol. 2, Minaean Inscriptions, nos. 7, 13, 17, 23, 31. The kabirate was hereditary in certain cases, as in the clan ḪLL, Hartmann, p. 243. Hartmann (p. 443, n. 2) denies the opinion of D. H. Müller and Mordtmann that the *kabīr* had priestly function, but Rhodokanakis, in Nielsen's *Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde*, 1, 130, holds that "his official position appears to have been originally that of a priest who offered rain-offerings in all temples of Athtar of DBN." For this function he refers to a text published in his *Katabanische Studien*, 2, 53ff., where are recorded the offerings of one of the clan ḪLL for the rains of autumn and spring. (Cf. the water-pouring at Sukkoth in the temple at Jerusalem.) And this priestly function is supported by the occasional dating "in the month X of the *r wt* of Y," *ršwt* denoting priestly office. This system of dating by annual pontiffs

On the basis of this identification of Hebrew *ḫoref*[8] with SArab. *ḫrp* in the technical denotation of the latter term, we gain for the original text of 𝔊: "Azariah b. Sadok, the priest over the year," or in a word, "over the calendar." The following officer is then Ahijah b. (read בן) Shisha, scribe (read ספר), which is corroborated by Greek evidence, as we have seen. Azariah, be it observed, heads the list as highest functionary, comparable to the *līmu* of Assyria and the *kabīr* of South Arabia. He is a priest in view of the sacred character of his office in determining the year, and similar to the Roman Pontifex Maximus, although even as in the case of the last office, he may not have been of sacerdotal origin; compare Julius Caesar.[9] As son of a Sadok Azariah may have been of the sacerdotal family of that name, if such a Sadok ever existed.[10] If a

---

came later to be simplified by devising an era named after a certain Mbḥḍ bn 'bḥṣ, this era being recorded for the year 385 (*CIS* iv, no. 46) and the year 396 (ib. no. 448, see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, 2, 93ff.). This era is probably to be identified with that of the kings of Saba and du-Raidan, dating from 115 (or 118) B. C.; see Winckler, *Zwei Inschriften über den Dammbruch von Marib* (*MVAG*, 1897, part 6), 20ff., 123ff. On the basis of *CIS*, no. 83, Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, ii, 351ff., claims to find an *interrex* for the *epagomena* of the year; this is denied by Hartmann, pp. 443f. The term "between autumn (*ḫrp*) and spring" on which Winckler bases his opinion, I am inclined to think expresses the winter solstice. Hartmann notes that royalty never appears as eponym, as in the Akkadian *līmūtū*. Glaser 1601, published by Rhodokanakis, *Katab. Stud.*, 1, 7ff., refers to the annual succession of the *kabīrs*, on which the editor remarks, p. 48, that the civil year for taxation coincided with those officers' terms. The fixation of the calendar year was imperative for reasons of business as well as of religion; hence the exact calendar in the highly organized economical system of South Arabia and the need of it in the rapidly expanding economics of the Israelite monarchy. Cf. the economic meaning of *calendarium* in Latin; see Pauly, *s. v.*

[8] N. b. the correct perpetuation of the vocalization in 𝔊.

[9] For the Babylonian calendar and the new year and its solemn inauguration, cf. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorient. Geisteskultur*, 1929, cc. 10, 11.

[10] "Sadok and Abiathar priests" of 𝔐 4 4 is missing in 𝔊 2 46h; the appointment of Sadok as the priest in 2 35 is secondary, as remarked above, note 4. The attempted identification of our Azariah b. Sadok made in the Chronicler's list of high priests, 1 Ch. 5 28ff. (6 1ff.) is amazing. There we find the succession, Sadok, Ahimaaz, Azariah, Johanan, Azariah, with the appended note: "He it is who pontificated in the house that Solomon built in Jerusalem"—a gloss that was meant in comment on the first Azariah.

layman, son of any Sadok, he recalls the hitherto unexplained items in the list of David's officers 2 Sam. 8 18, "David's sons were priests," which has been dodged by versions ever since (Moffatt's is an exception), the English versions preserving the timeworn "chief ministers," descended from the Latin.[11] "Priests" here equated with Azariah's function as "priest over the year" evidently makes those sons of David eponyms for the year. We thus obtain for *kōhen* a new denotation and from one of the most ancient of Hebrew archival records; do we have here its most primitive meaning?[12]

But this equation of אליחרף with "over the year," while plausible to the proponent, lacked demonstration. Now in the process of considering the other details of 𝔊 at 2 46h he came to recognize, as argued above, that Βαναια υιος Ιωδαε is a gloss correcting a preceding item. The following unintegrated *ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλαρχίας καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πλινθίου* may then be equally glossatory.[13] The first item is *hapax legomenon* in Greek literature and papyri, so far as I can discover; but it has a unique cognate at 2 Sam. 8 18, *υἱοὶ Δαυειδ αὐλάρχαι ἦσαν*, where *αυλ*. translates the already discussed כהנים. Accordingly the phrase appears to be a gloss to *τοῦ ἱερέως* above, see col. iii, and so I place it in parallelism therewith in col. iv.[14]

What with the following (*και*) *επι του πλινθιου*? Presumably *επι* = אל (על) in my analyzed אל חרף; then *πλινθιου* = חרף. This noun is known in the smaller lexicons as "brick," then "square," etc.[15] In Judaistic Greek it occurs in Josephus, *AJ* xiii, 4, 4, of a square of troops. And in an item of Theodotion's preserved at 2 Sam. 20 23 (see Field), Benaiah b. Jehoiada was ἐπὶ τοῦ πλινθίου (= על הכרי "over the Carians," or "Cretans," with Krē) καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δυνατούς (= על הפלתי "over the Pelethites"). This appears like a rash application by the later Theodotion of material he obtained from 2 46h.

---

[11] We note here the otherwise unidentified Ira, who was "a priest of David's," 2 Sa. 20 26.

[12] The writer believes it to be an expansion of the root כון "stand," a participle with the *hemzah-h*; see his note in this *Journal*, 1927, 144ff. As the officer who stands, is appointed over the year, *kōhen* would have a plausible etymology. Its ultimate investment with the sacerdotal idea would have its interesting parallel in the Roman-Christian development of *Pontifex Maximus*, one of the proudest titles of the Pope.

[13] For such glosses in the Gr. I may refer to the analysis of two obscure texts in my *Daniel*, 356—358, 401—404.

[14] In view of this parallelism of *αυλαρχιας* and *αυλαρχουντες* these glosses appear to represent the original text and to have been later dispossessed.

[15] Greek bricks were predominantly square; Vitruvius, ii, 3, 3.

But Stephen's *Thesaurus linguae graecae* opened up a wider vista. Πλινθίον as "a square" came to be used of the square basis for sundials, etc., and ultimately became a technical name for such instruments.[16] The fullest discussion of these solar instruments is given by Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, ix, cc. 7, 8 on the Analemma and on Sundials and Waterclocks.[17] In c. 8, 1 he names a variety of instruments for solar observation, among them "the Plinthium or Lacunar, like the one placed in the Circus Flaminius by Scopinas of Syracuse." The word also went over into the Latin, *plinthium*.

Now this plinth, quadrans, lacunar, was not only a sundial in our sense for measuring the hours of the day, but, with yet greater importance, an instrument for marking the seasons of the year by the length of the sun's shadow. It would be easy to construct empirically for a given latitude a gnomon with the length of the sun's shadow marked on its plinth or base for the round of the year, with the solstices and equinoxes as cardinal points. If the calendar year began in autumn, the solstice point once specified on such a plinth would determine annually the beginning of the year. And so this *ḥoref-ḥarīf* point gave its name to the calendar year. The *līmu* or *kabīr* had charge of officially registering and proclaiming (cf. *kalendae*) this annual epoch.[18]

---

[16] And so the Latin *quadrans*, French *cadran*, English and German *quadrant*. The modern quadrant for observing the attitude of the sun appears to have this philological pedigree. The Oxford *New English Dictionary* gives two words "quadrant," but without observing this history.

[17] See Morgan's translation, 1914, pp. 270ff. Cf. Delambre, *Histoire de l'astronomie ancienne*, bk. 4 (in vol. 2, 1817), c. 17, "Cadrans." Thus Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, c. 4, speaks of "a small table like this plinth here which makes what is called an acute angle with the plane and so is the measurement of the altitude of the pole from the horizon." He proceeds in the following chapter to refer to the gnomon at Syene, which proved that that point was not at the equator. (Wyttenbach's text, 410 E and the translations by Goodwin, 1870, and King, 1889.) The same writer uses the word, *Romulus*, 22, and *Camillus*, 32, of the square drawn by the augurs which orientated them to the cardinal points.

Such plinths were continued into the Arabic civilization. I may refer to the publication by MM. G. Ryckmans and F. Moreau of "Un gnomon arabe du XIVe siècle" in *Le Muséon*, 39 (1926), 33—40. This article, with full interpretation of the object, presents a plate of the plinth, Arabic *basīṭah*, a square block of travertine of 24 m. square (cf. the square plinths of the Greek use), on which are marked the positions of the sun's shadow cast by the gnomon at the solstices and equinoxes, these points being connected by proper curves. That is, it is a dial for the solar year. It has further the practical religious use of determining the time of the *'aṣr* or afternoon prayer (related to the Jewish evening *tamīd*), this being worked out by a parabolic curve starting from the gnomon on the side of the afternoon shadow.[19]

How ancient such a cultic solar dial was, is not known. It is doubtless of Oriental, Babylonian origin. But it must have been invented early, by empirical observation. It was used not only for determining the religious hours of the day, but also for the ecclesiastical seasons, as the Arabic instruments show. We may suppose that Ahaz's dial (2 Ki. 20 8ff., Is. 38 7) had similar functions.

The above argument would demonstrate that the early Hebrew monarchy possessed the year-eponymate. It can be traced back till c. 1000 B. C. for David's reign, almost as high a chronology as that of the Akkadian *līmu*-ship. It is connected philologically with the South-Arabian kabirate and resembles it in the parallelism of *kōhen* with the priestly office of some of the South-

---

[18] Ideler, *Historische Untersuchungen*, 270, notes the use of a gnomon for fixing in the Greek year the autumn equinox, remarking that the fixation of the equinoctial points was a particularly simple matter requiring no mathematical calculation.

[19] The authors cite earlier literature on this Arab "gnomonistic." I have not been able to see a Munich thesis, just published, on the same subject, by P. Schmalzl, *Zur Geschichte der Quadranten bei den Arabern*, Munich, 1929.

Arabian *kabīrs*; in this it is unlike the Assyrian office. There are some important corollaries to be drawn.

In Samuel-Kings we have remains of original official archives, dated according to the eponym of the year in question.

From the Arabic connection of the Hebrew term we may deduce early relations between Israel and the South-Arabian civilization, and argue for the antiquity of the usage in the latter field, for which we have not been able to obtain a *terminus ad quem*, although the scholars in that subject recognize its high antiquity.[20]

We gain a new insight into the extent of early Hebrew civilization.

Finally, we have to pay more respect to the chronological data in Kings.

---

[20] Hartmann, *op. cit.* 443: "Wir finden es, soweit wir an der Hand der Denkmäler zurückgehen können."

DOUBLE ENTENDRE IN THE FIRST SPEECH OF ELIPHAZ

KEMPER FULLERTON
OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

I. Introductory. In an article on "The original Conclusion to the Book of Job" (*ZATW*, 1924) the present writer ventured to suggest a new approach to the solution of its critical problems. The main idea of the essay was that the author of Job made, at certain points, very effective use of *double entendre.* This literary device appeared particularly at 40 3–5, which was taken to be the original end of the book, in the Jahweh speeches, Chapters 38—39, and in the Prologue. These passages were all supposed to be written in such a way that the orthodox reader could peruse them with approval, whereas the more attentive reader would find in them an indirect but none the less real criticism of the orthodox position. Thus the orthodox reader would see in 40 3—5 a confession of repentance; but what the author meant to suggest to one who could read between the lines was that nothing further could be said on the subject. Similarly, in the Jahweh speeches, the orthodox reader would see a well deserved rebuke of Job, but the more attentive reader would find in them a suggestion that the world is an insoluble enigma. In the Prologue, once more, the orthodox reader would be highly edified by the scenes on earth in which the patience and piety of Job were so beautifully exemplified, while the one who looked below the surface would be more interested by the scenes in heaven, which are described, not naively as is commonly supposed, but with great sophistication, and are intended to suggest in cryptic fashion the inexplicability of suffering. It is believed that Chapters 4—5 furnish another example of the same subtlety of method. If the interpretation of these chapters offered in what follows does not carry conviction, this will not necessarily disprove the previous positions taken in the above-mentioned article, though it might suggest a doubt of them. On the other hand, if it is accepted, it will add greatly to their strength.

The accompanying translation is a specimen of what the writer would like to do for all the original parts of Job if time and strength should permit. The audacity of adding one more to the numerous translations of this poem is fully realized and probably the writer will be made to realize the folly of it as well. The comments are intended primarily to explain the translation, and to support the criticism which underlies the interpretation. The bracketed passages are inserted either to help out the interpretation or to strengthen the rhythmical effect in the English. The ancient versions have been used rather to illustrate how Job was understood by the early translators than to correct the Massoretic text. Textual criticism is, of course, fundamental to exegesis and interpretation, but if the exegete or interpreter were to wait till the final returns from textual criticism were all in, he would be compelled to take an enforced holiday for many a year to come. But while the highly technical and exceptionally delicate work of the textual critic is going on, a work for which the writer must admit his incompetence, the interpreter may nevertheless feel free to do his bit, provided, always, that he realizes the tentative character of his conclusions. But this is only one expression of the humility which all those who are seeking for certitudes among the fragmentary documents of the past, or for the originally intended meaning of some great work of the imagination, such as the Book of Job, should studiously cultivate. The comments also seek to provide a sufficient, though by no means exhaustive, history of the main trends in the interpretation of Job.[1]

[1] I list herewith the works which have been most frequently consulted, indicating the abbreviations used in referring to them:

Ewald (Ew.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 2nd ed., 1854. Merx (Mx.), *Das Gedicht*

II. Translation. Job 4 and 5.

4 1. *And Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said:*

I. Expostulation

1

4 2. *1a. If one essay a word with thee, wilt thou take it ill?*
2b. Yet who (under like provocation) could keep from speaking?

2

4 3. *1a. Consider how thou didst (once) admonish many,*
2b. To weary hands new strength thou wouldst impart,
4 4. *3c. Him that stumbled thy advice would steady,*
4d. And tottering knees by thee would be confirmed.

3

4 5. *1a. Now that it cometh to thy turn thou takest it ill,*
2b. Now that it toucheth thee, thou art confounded!
4 6. *3c. Should not thy religion be thy confidence,*
4d. And thy blameless life thy hope?

4

4 7. *1a. Bethink thee, what innocent man ever perished,*
2b. Or where have the upright been destroyed?

---

von Hiob, 1871. Hitzig (Hitz.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1874. Delitzsch (De.), *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job*, 2nd (English) ed., 1881. Davidson (Da.), *The Book of Job* (Cambridge Bible), 1889. Dillmann (Di.), *Hiob*, 4th ed., 1891. Duhm (Du.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1897. Beer (Be.), *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 1897. Peake, *Job* (New Century Bible), 1905. Barton (Bart.), The Book of Job (*Bible for Home and School*), 1911. Schmidt, N., *Messages of the Poets*, 1911. Budde (Bu.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 2nd ed., 1913. Ehrlich (Ehr.), *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. VI, 1913. Jastrow (Jast.), *The Book of Job*, 1921. Volz, Hiob (*Schriften des Alten Testaments*), 1921. Driver-Gray (Dr.), The Book of Job (*International Critical Commentary*), 1921. Ball, *The Book of Job*, 1922. Steuernagel (Steuer.), Hiob (Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 4th ed.), 1923. Buttenwieser (Bt.), *The Book of Job*, 1925. König (K.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1929.

The Commentaries of Torczyner (1924) and Thilo (1925) have, unfortunately, not been accessible to me except indirectly through König's work.

Other abbreviations:

Aq. = *Aquila*, G. = *The Septuagint*, Sym. = *Symmachus*, Syr. = Syriac, Th. = *Theodotion*, T. or Targ. = *Targum*, V. = *Vulgate*, EV. = *AV and RV*.

4 8. *3c. As I have observed, (only) they that plow evil*
4d. And sow (the seeds of) harm, reap the same.

II. Instruction and Warning

A. The Oracle on the Universality of Sin

1

4 12. *1a. A word (once) stole upon me,*
2b. Mine ear caught a whisper thereof,
4 13. *3a. When visions of the night yield thoughts confused and vague,*
4b. And trance more deep than sleep descendeth on mankind.

2

4 14. *1a. Dread came upon me and quaking,*
2b. The very marrow of my bones was filled with dread;
4 15. *3a. (Furtively) there hasteth by, brushing my face, a breath of air,*
4b. The hair of my head standeth up, my flesh doth creep.

3

4 16. *1a. I feel a presence,*
2b. But recognize no shape,
3c. A shadowy semblance (wavereth) before mine eyes,
4d. And through the stillness a voice, from stillness scarce distinguishable, reacheth mine ears.

4

4 17. *1a. CAN MORTAL MAN BE INNOCENT IN GOD'S SIGHT?*
2b. IN THE PRESENCE OF HIS CREATOR CAN (EARTH-BORN) MAN BE CLEAN?

5

4 18. *1a. E'en in His angelic ministrants no confidence he placeth,*
2b. And to His messengers He imputeth error;
4 19. *3c. What then shall be said of those whose housing's clay,*
4d. Whose foundations in the dust are laid?
5a. Who, like an empty birds-nest, are destroyed,

4 20. 6*b*. *Betwixt morn and even are shattered utterly,*
7*d*. *Who, with none to lay it to heart, perish forever?*
4 21. 8*a*. *When their tent-pin is pulled up,*
9*b*. *Shall they not die the death of ignorant men?*

B. On the Danger of Impatience

1

5 1. 1*a*. ****************************** *(?)*
2*b*. ****************************** *(?)*
5 2. 3*a*. *Yea, impatience killeth the fool,*
4*b*. *And passion slayeth him that is without self-control.*

2

5 3. 1*a*. *I myself once saw a fool taking root,*
2*a*. *And suddenly accursed became his homestead;*
5 4. 3*a*. *And now that man's sons are of help bereft,*
4*b*. *The Court abandons them to oppression sore, with none to save them.*

3

5 5. 1*a*. *What they harvest the famished eat*
2*b*. **************** *the thirsty* *********
3*a*. **************** *thorns* ************
4*b*. ************************************ *(?)*

III. Consolations

A. Job is urged to turn to God, the Omnipotent, for Help.

1

5 8. 1*a*. *But I, for my part, would turn for help to God,*
2*b*. *Yea, unto God would I make my appeal;*
5 9. 3*a*. *(God) who doeth great things, and things unsearchable,*
4*b*. *Wonderful things beyond all reckoning;*

2

5 10. 1*a*. *Who giveth rain unto the (parched) earth,*
2*b*. *And sendeth showers upon the pasture-lands all open to the sky;*
5 11. 3*a*. *Lifting the lowly to the heights,*
4*b*. *While they that mourn to safety are exalted;*

3

5 12. *1a. Frustrating the intrigues of the crafty,*
2b. So their power effecteth nought that endureth,
5 13. *3c. Capturing the cunning in their own craftiness.*
4d. While the counsel of the crooked is surprised by sudden disaster.

4

5 15. *1a. So He saveth the afflicted from the sword,*
2b. And the poor from the power of the strong,
5 16. *3a. And hope hath come to the dejected,*
4b. And injustice hath stopped her mouth.

B. The Promise of a happy End

1

5 17. *1a. Happy the man whom God reproveth!*
2b. The discipline of the Almighty do not thou despise,
5 18. *3c. For He that causeth the pain dresseth the wound,*
4d. He smiteth, but 'tis His hands that heal.

2

5 19. *1a. In six misfortunes will He deliver thee,*
2b. In seven thou shalt be untouched of calamity;
5 20. *3a. In famine He redeemeth thee from death,*
4b. In war from the power of the sword.

3

5 21. *1a. From the lash of the (slanderer's) tongue protected thou shalt be,*
2b. Thou shalt have no cause to fear when ruin draweth nigh;
5 22. *3a. At ********* thou shalt laugh,*
4b. And of wild beasts thou needest not be afraid.

4

5 23. *1a. The (very) stones of the ground are in league with thee,*
2b. And the wild beasts are (all) at peace with thee;
5 24. *3a. Thou shalt have the assurance that thy tent is secure,*
4b. When thy estate thou dost inspect, not one thing shall be missing.

5

5 25. *1a. Thou shalt have the assurance of a numerous seed,*
2b. Of descendants (as many) as the wild-flowers;
5 26. *3a. In a ripe old age thou shalt come to the grave,*
4b. As a sheaf of grain to the threshing-floor in its season.

6

5 27. *1a. See! thus have we searched truth out*; *so is it,*
2b. (It agrees with what) we have heard; *do thou also lay it to heart.*

III. Interpretation. In spite of certain obscurities in its phrasing and connections, probably due to text corruption, the first speech of Eliphaz is one of the most carefully thought-out and artistic speeches in the book. Its meaning, however, does not lie on the surface. Yet the attempt must be made to discover it if the subsequent argument in the Dialogue is to be intelligently followed. Whatever may be thought of the interpretation of the speech here offered, it is hoped that at least a more precise definition of its problems has been attained than has hitherto been given. The author appears to have two main objects in view in its composition. In the first place, Eliphaz is to sound the key-note for the Friends and accordingly to present their case in as strong and attractive a way as possible. The complaint of Job in Chapter 3 suggests, at least at first sight and when taken by itself, that Job was in the wrong. In agreement with this the rejoinder of Eliphaz is intended to suggest, at first reading, that the Friends are in the right. Job's queries would raise uncomfortable thoughts in the minds of the pious. The affirmations of Eliphaz, doctrinally so sound and steadying, bring a welcome relief. Further, the dignity, sobriety, and beauty with which Eliphaz enforces his views contrast with the vehement, almost ungovernable outbursts of Job, to the great initial disadvantage of the latter. A contrast so unmistakable must be intended by the author. But is this all that was intended? Is there not another note in the discourse than that of serenity and gentleness, a note which is only faintly sounded, it is true, but which may furnish the key to all that follows?

In order to detect this subtle overtone one must consider exactly in what mood Eliphaz addressed Job, what was the impression which he intended to make upon him; and also, and this is all important, what impression he was likely actually to make upon a man of Job's temperament, and experience. In other words, we must listen to this speech first with the ear of Eliphaz's colleagues and of the orthodox circles in Judaism which they represent, and afterwards with the ear of Job himself. We may then discover that the author's second object in the composition of Chapters 4 and 5 is to hint at certain flaws in Eliphaz's position. But these flaws are purposely obscured, these other notes muffled, in order that the Friends may seem gloriously in the right as against Job. The subtle skill with which all this is done is proved, as Delitzsch long ago pointed out, by the difficulty which the Expositors have always experienced in detecting just what was false in the speech. We may discover that they have not sufficiently allowed for the power of psychological analysis which the author of Job possessed to an extraordinary degree.

The speech falls into three main divisions: a) Eliphaz's apology for expostulating with Job, 4 1—8; b) the main didactic section, 4 12—5 5, subdivided into two parts, the oracular instruction, 4 12—21, and the warning to Job of the danger of impatience, drawn from Eliphaz's own experience, 5 2—5; c) the final consolations, 5 8—27.

A. If we look at the argument of Eliphaz from his own point of view, we note, in the first place, that the longest portion of it, which is at the same time its culmination, is consolatory. These consolations are couched in really beautiful language, especially as Eliphaz warms to his subject, and, turning directly to Job (5 17—27) in what is probably the finest stanza of the speech, (5 17—18) substitutes, very significantly, the kindlier doctrine of suffering as chastisement for the harsher doctrine of retribution, and closes with the exquisitely tender and beautiful figure of the sheaf of grain brought to the threshing-floor in its season. A ripe old age, gently mellowing as nature mellows, coming to its transformation at the end of life as nature comes to its autumnal change, a thought from which the abnormality and repulsiveness of death are entirely eliminated—all this may be in store for Job, purified in character and refined through God's fatherly chastisement! No hypocrite can utter such words as these. Here, at least, speaks a true and kindly friend.

But even in the didactic portion of the speech, 4 12—21, which is elaborated in the present text at great length and given an added emphasis through its oracular form, Eliphaz seems to show the greatest considerateness for Job. He implicates him in sin, it is true, but in the gentlest possible way. He does not accuse him of any specific transgressions which might account for his sufferings. He refers only to the general sinfulness of man which is inherent in man's creatureliness. Job, it is implied, must expect to suffer, not because he was a sinner above all others, but because he was a man. And what man can be clean in the eyes of his creator? This train of thought agrees with the consolations at the end of the speech, and especially with the doctrine of suffering as chastisement, in the fact that both this doctrine and the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of man as man equally divert the attention from the doctrine of retribution and therefore from Job's own individual sins. In this passage, as in the concluding one, the nobility of the language, the impressive way in which the oracle is described, and the truth of the oracle itself, which few people in antiquity would refuse to accept—all these admirable qualities strongly recommend the position of Eliphaz to the reader. They show the assured calm and the profound reverence of this friend of Job to advantage as contrasted with Job's fury that verges on blasphemy. Thus, in these two longest and most important sections of the speech Eliphaz evidently makes a sincere attempt to be fair to Job. He studiously refrains from any direct or personal attack upon him as a sinner.

In the introductory section, 4 2—8, there is, indeed, a word of rebuke. But how justifiable it is in the circumstances, and how very gently administered! Eliphaz finds no fault with Job's past life; that was beautiful and ideal. Job was a religious man and of blameless conduct. In times past he was able to minister consolations to others not so fortunate as himself. All this Eliphaz freely acknowledges and in doing so unwittingly confirms Jahweh's judgment of Job given in the Prologue and is thus represented by the author as tacitly ignoring for the moment the doctrine of retribution as an explanation of his friend's predicament. But what Eliphaz cannot understand, and the pious, orthodox reader would again sympathize with him at this point, is why Job should feel so distraught. He cannot refrain, (what faithful friend could?) from reminding Job that his religion and his upright life should now stand him in good stead. "For what innocent man ever perished or where have the upright been destroyed?" Here, unquestionably, the doctrine of retribution is introduced, but, most significantly, *in its consolatory aspect.* V. 7 in its present connection can only be meant as an encouragement. Furthermore, all this very careful and clearly deliberate consideration for Job's feelings on the part of Eliphaz is especially creditable to him in view of the fact that he was appalled at Job's condition and yet was compelled to listen to a speech from his friend which would undoubtedly shock his own sensitiveness to the sanctities of life most deeply. It violated that "fear of the Lord," that reverence for the Holy, which Eliphaz regarded and rightly so as a fundamental element in religion. It would thus appear from the portions of the speech already examined that Eliphaz, who, as is generally recognized, is an elderly man, has managed, under the greatest provocation, to control his feelings quite admirably. As he supposed, he was doing the very best he could by his friend. What more could be expected of him? In all this there is no indication of any insincerity or unkindness, and doctrinally he was true to the deepest convictions of the pious of his day. They would certainly understand the statements of Eliphaz thus far brought under review in the way indicated above and would heartily approve of them. But would Job? If we now turn to listen to Eliphaz's speech as Job listened to it, we receive a quite different impression.

B. A jarring note is struck first of all at 4 8. The verse in itself and apart from its context undoubtedly sounds like a rather harsh warning. Yet it evidently goes with v. 7, for the two verses, taken together, formulate the doctrine of rewards and punishments in a very striking way and hence should not be separated. The innocent man cannot perish, v. 7, that is the consolatory side of the doctrine; the wicked man is bound to perish, v. 8, that is its menacing side. But v. 7, in view of the preceding verses, is clearly intended to encourage Job. If v. 8 were meant to be a warning to him, it would conflict with vv. 1—7 in a most unfortunate way. After the recognition of Job's goodness in v. 6 and the encouragement based on it in v. 7, nothing could be more ill-timed than the warning in v. 8 if that were deliberately aimed at him. Thus interpreted, v. 8 would also be equally irreconcilable with the spirit of vv. 12—21. In them, as we have seen, it was Eliphaz's purpose to implicate Job in sin only generally and indirectly. He was a sinner as all men are sinners. Sin is inherent in mankind. Sin and therefore suffering are racial concomitants. V. 8, on the other hand, suggests immediate personal responsibility for suffering because of specific transgressions. If v. 8 were intended as a warning, it could only suggest to Job that his very unusual sufferings were due to exceptionally heinous sins. It is obvious that v. 8, interpreted as a warning to Job, has no place in its present context. It would spoil the impression of friendliness toward Job which Eliphaz in those parts of the speech already examined so evidently desires to create. Accordingly, if v. 8 is to be retained as an integral part of the text, it must be interpreted as a further expression of Eliphaz's desire to comfort his friend. This can be done very easily if it is assumed that Eliphaz impliedly excludes him from the class of the trouble-makers. Job can console himself with the thought that no innocent man ever suffered; it is only the sinners, who inevitably reap the trouble which they have sown for themselves. *And Job is not to be included among them.* This would seem to be the necessary implication of 4 8 in its present connection.[2]

[2] There would never have been any questioning of this interpretation had it not been for vv. 9—11. It is true that these verses might also be interpreted as excluding Job from their threats and this has often been done (cf., with more or less explicitness, De., Da., Peake, Dr., Bu., Volz, Steuer.,

But the question now arises, would Job perceive this implication? Would he naturally take v. 8 as an encouragement rather than a warning? This is difficult to suppose under the circumstances. It must not be forgotten that at the outset Job shared with his Friends the current doctrine of retribution. But in the overwhelming nature of the trouble which had overtaken him this particular explanation of it had been lost sight of. He could only gasp out, Why, Why, Why? But now, as he pondered the doctrine of which he had just been most unfortunately reminded by Eliphaz, and then considered his own plight, would it not seem to him that the minatory side of the doctrine in v. 8 applied to him much more exactly than the consolatory side in v. 7? Had he not reaped a harvest of suffering almost overwhelming in extent, and must he not draw the conclusion, unintended by Eliphaz, that he was among those who plowed evil? At this point it is most important to distinguish between the effect which Eliphaz intended to produce by his words and the effect which he actually did produce, for it enables us to see into the remarkable subtlety of our author's method. The doctrine of retribution in its minatory aspect was to be the major premise of the Friends in the great debate that follows. It is highly important, therefore, that it should be introduced at the very beginning of the argument. On the other hand, the author did not wish to make Eliphaz prejudge Job's case at the outset or to be intentionally unkind to him as he would have been if the statement in v. 8 were intended as a solemn warning to his suffering friend. Accordingly, Eliphaz is allowed to couple the threatening aspect of the doctrine in v. 8 with the consoling aspect of it in v. 7 in such a way as to suggest that Eliphaz

Ball). But it is not natural to do so. If these verses are included, the warning is no longer simply the reverse side of the promise in v. 7. It becomes, so to speak, an end in itself, and arrogates to itself the chief emphasis of the first part of the speech (cf. Ew., Di., Bt., K.). By elaborating to such an extent the warning in v. 8 rather than the consolation in v. 7 Eliphaz would betray an entirely different animus toward Job from the one with which we have found him to be inspired. Thus, from the point of view of the speech as a whole serious doubt is cast upon the originality of 4 9—11. See, further, Explanatory Comments.

meant to have Job interpret what was said in v. 8 by what was said in the preceding verses, that is, in a way favorable to himself. But alas! Job interpreted it (he could hardly do otherwise) out of his own experience. He therefore saw an unsympathetic warning in what his friend intended to be an additional word of comfort. Thus the author secured ar emarkably serviceable starting-point for the Debate. The great theme of it is announced at the outset. But it is introduced in a purposely ambiguous way which leads to an initial misunderstanding between the Friends and Job and thus prepares the way for all the tensions and complications that are to follow.[3]

But did the author have any ulterior motive in the way in which he permitted Eliphaz to introduce the thought of v. 8 in addition to providing a suitable beginning for the discussion of the doctrine of retribution? Eliphaz cannot be supposed to be interested in the exegencies of what may be called the author's plot. Why should he feel it necessary to add the unfortunate suggestion in v. 8 which Job would so easily misunderstand? Granted that the latter verse was also intended to afford consolation to Job in its own way, it is quite unnecessary after v. 7. Is it possible that the author, by putting v. 8 into the mouth of Eliphaz, wishes to suggest to the attentive reader that there is a certain flaw in his character? Has Eliphaz made a *faux pas* in supplementing the thought in v. 7 by the one in v. 8, *and did the author intend to have him do this?* Is it possible that Eliphaz is pictured as so obsessed by the orthodox doctrine of rewards and punishments that, having formulated the comforting side of it, he almost unconsciously and automatically adds the threatening side as well, unmindful of the unfortunate inference Job might draw from it with regard to himself? And is this unmindfulness to be explained by the fact that Eliphaz, in the author's conception of him, is so addicted to general formulas as solvents for life's problems that he has lost all sense for reality and is therefore unable to bring to the consideration of Job's peculiar case the sympathetic imagination which would prevent him from saying the wrong thing or even the right thing at the wrong time? If there was only v. 8 to consider it would be venturesome to answer these questions in the affirmative, but there are other features in this speech which may warrant our doing so. An examination of 5 2—5 is of great importance in this connection.

---

[3] If the above interpretation of the author's purpose is correct, it is clear that 4 8 is exactly in the position he intended it to be and cannot be deleted, as some critics (e. g. Du.) have suggested should be done, without marring most unfortunately the author's artistic achievement.

If the probable effect of 4 8 upon Job is not altogether a happy one, still less so are Job's strictures upon the Fool in 5 2—5.[4] This passage is unquestionably an organic part of the speech and a very important part, for Job makes it the starting point of his reply. What Eliphaz says in it touched Job to the quick. But again the question must be raised whether Eliphaz meant to hurt his friend. Does the real hardness, one might almost say savagery, of the man suddenly break out here in an unguarded moment, or is Eliphaz unaware of the pain he was inflicting? Owing to the somewhat uncertain character of the text at the end of Chapter 4 and the beginning of Chapter 5 we cannot be quite sure of how the author wished to relate it to what precedes. The passage has nothing to do with any theoretical explanation of suffering. It is a warning against the danger of impatience. This warning can only refer to Job's speech in Chapter 3. Job's retort at 6 2 makes this clear. The thought would seem to turn back, after the paragraph upon the universal sinfulness of man, to the restiveness of Job noted by Eliphaz at 4 5 in his introductory expostulation. It is as if Eliphaz, himself, seemed to realize that he had not quite met the situation when he urged the universal sinfulness of man as explanation of Job's troubles. Job's impatience and passion, as exhibited in his speech, needed a rebuke. Granted that his *sufferings* could not be traced to any specific transgressions in the past that merited them, but only to the fact that he participated in the racial sin of mankind, his *speech* was another matter. Job's past life may have been all that could be desired (4 2—5) but this speech of his was unpardonable. What right had any man, frail and sinful as he was by his very nature, to complain against the Almighty? These fierce oubtursts of Job threatened to compromise that "fear," that reverence, due to the Creator from the creature and without which no religion worthy of the name could exist. They savored of impiety, rebellion.[5] With all his effort to be considerate of his friend, Eliphaz felt it to be his duty to warn him of the spiritual risk he ran. But even so, he did not do this directly. He began by stating the danger of impatience only as a general principle. "Impatience killeth the fool and passion slayeth one who is without self-control." Unfortunately, he went on to illustrate the principle by citing an experience of his own with such a person. He himself had once seen a fool taking root, as if his prosperity were permanently assured; but suddenly his homestead was accursed, his family scattered. Here was a picture drawn pat to Job's situation. Listening to these lines with Job's ear, one can readily understand how he could not fail to apply them to himself. Had he not been prosperous? Had he not come to grief? Had he not given way to impatience? That word, "suddenly," in Eliphaz's mouth was particularly unfortunate. It would inevitably remind Job of those visitations, so swiftly following each other, described in the Prologue. But did Eliphaz mean to suggest these painful comparisons? Did he intend by means of v. 3 to say: Thou art the man? If so, this passage would fall as completely out of line with the speech as a whole as 4 8 does when interpreted as an intentional warning. Are we, then, to revise the view of Eliphaz's character, tentatively suggested above, and see in 4 8 and 5 2—5 a reflection of the real attitude of Eliphaz toward Job, though he permits himself the luxury of expressing it only at these two points, an attitude of hateful suspicion and cruel vindictiveness? If Eliphaz fully realized how naturally Job could apply these words to himself, no other interpretation of his character is possible. But in that case the labored attempt to implicate Job only in the general sin of mankind, in order to avoid accusing him of specific sins, would be purposeless,[6] and the final consolations, in spite of their great beauty, would not be honestly meant. This venerable man would then have to be regarded as a master of irony and bitter innuendo and a most offensive hypocrite, masking his real feelings for the most part under the guise of friendship, but now and then allowing the unloveliness of his true character to break out in cruel flings at Job. This is undoubtedly a possible interpretation of the character of Eliphaz as revealed in this speech. But in spite of the fact that it has been advocated more or less clearly by a number of scholars, I do not think it does justice to the real intentions of our author or to the fineness of his method. If it were adopted, the ensuing Dialogue would have to be understood as only bringing to increasingly clear expression the Friends' abhorrence of Job which they had entertained from the beginning. But I believe the author's conception of the character of Eliphaz and of the function of the Dialogue to be a far more subtle one. The Dialogue, so far as the attitude of the Friends toward Job is concerned, is not designed to illustrate merely an intensification of their original abhorrence of him, but rather a change from a friendly, though a bit suspicious attitude at the outset, occasioned by Job's first speech, to one of the fiercest opposition, occasioned by their growing conviction of his previous sins. And this change, as we shall see, is due to the logical working out of the Friends' fixed principles.

---

[4] The omission of 5 1 and 5 6—7, on the usual explanation of the latter passage, has no effect upon the following interpretation of 5 2—5. See Explanatory Comments.

---

[5] I take it that 5 2—5 thus goes back in thought to 4 5, but the rebuke which Eliphaz feels it his duty to administer at this point receives added emphasis from what is said in 4 12—21. This section is not intended to be simply the introduction to the rebuke in 5 2—5. It has an independent value of its own as a theoretical explanation of Job's sufferings, but it does serve at the same time to give emphasis to the sin of Job's impatience. How can Job, a creature frail and sinful, dare to complain against his Creator? It is most important to remember that in 5 2—5 Eliphaz is not raising the question of Job's sins *prior* to his sufferings and which therefore, on the basis of the doctrine of retribution, would account for them, but to the sin of his speech which occurs *after* his sufferings and therefore cannot account for them. The debate formally opens when Eliphaz raises the question of the propriety of Job's speech. The interesting implications of 4 8 for the development of the debate are as yet unutilized.

---

[6] 4 12—21 would have to be reinterpreted, not as an expression of Eliphaz's consideration for Job, not as having independent value as a theory of suffering, but as intended to serve only as an introduction to the warning at 5 2ff. and to give added emphasis to it.

But how, it may be asked, was it possible for Eliphaz to be oblivious to the application of what he was saying in 5 2—5 to Job? In the first place Eliphaz was thinking at this point in his speech primarily of the sin of Job's complaints and the danger of punishment he ran because of them. The punishment of the fool *followed on his impatience.* He was therefore thinking of the punishment which might *hereafter* follow on Job's complaints; he was not thinking of Job's sufferings or of their cause. That subject was sufficiently treated in 4 12—21. Hence he overlooked the fact that the fate of the fool which *followed* on his complaints was much the same as the fate of Job which *preceded his* complaints. But Job, whose mind was so deeply exercised over the cause of his sufferings, would apply to himself what Eliphaz had said with a different intention, exactly as in the case of 4 8. Eliphaz's fool had perished for the sin of his impatience. Instead of taking it as a warning as to what might happen to himself in the future, Job took it as a hint of Eliphaz's belief concerning the meaning of what had happened to him in the past. He had suffered like this fool; Eliphaz must have thought that he was a sinner like this fool. So again we find Eliphaz expressing himself in a way that could be very easily misunderstood by Job, though he did not intend to refer directly to Job as is clear from 5 4b which does not correspond to the fate of Job's sons. But this explanation by itself is probably not sufficient to account for Eliphaz's seemingly total obliviousness to the probable application which Job would give to his words. At this point the author's conception of the character of Eliphaz must be taken into consideration. It is unquestionable that Eliphaz, in the thought of the author, is the exponent of current orthodoxy.

If my interpretation is correct, he is also thought of as a type of a certain kind of dogmatic theologian whose presuppositions are supposed to be divine revelations—Eliphaz claims to have received his doctrine through an oracle—and whose eyes are therefore blind to all that does not fit into the preconceived pattern. Now the difficulty with such persons is that they are *unintentionally* cruel. Confident of the final authority and universal applicability of their divinely revealed dogmas, they are unable to put themselves into the situation of another man and look at his problems from his point of view. They may have sympathy but it is an abstract sympathy, which is no helpful sympathy. They are unable to feel their way into ideas or experiences alien to their own. Dogma has a terrible power to dull the imagination, and without imagination sympathy is unable to help. So it was with Eliphaz. Appalled by Job's sufferings which he lamely attempts to account for by one or the other of his general formulas (4 12—21, 5 17f.), shocked by Job's complaints, the fierceness of which he does not try to condone because he has just attempted to generalize away the poignant personal agony of Job into the more or less impersonal suffering of mankind, he blunders through lack of any true understanding of the situation into language at 4 8 and 5 2—5 which only adds to Job's torment and increases his doubt. In other words, the sting in Eliphaz's allusions at 4 8 and 5 2—5 which the ear of Job was so painfully aware of was unintended by Eliphaz. He was too well satisfied with the all-sufficiency of his general formulas to realize what their effect might be upon one so peculiarly circumstanced as Job. If it be urged that such a conception of Eliphaz's character is a modernization altogether unlikely in an ancient author, I cannot admit the validity of the objection. The orthodox and dogmatic type of mind which trusts in inherited formulas is not confined to our era. It has found its incarnations in all ages and the probability is that it was a more prevalent phenomenon in ancient than in modern times. The astonishing thing is to find another mind in ancient times capable of understanding this type so fully and portraying its operations so accurately. Can we believe that the author of Job really had this power? I think we can. A study of Chapter 9, for example, reveals a truly amazing power in our author of psychological analysis. And several other features in those parts of the present speech which are especially intended to comfort Job, when listened to with Job's ear distinctly favor the view of Eliphaz's character here advocated.

The entire absence from the speech of any expression of sympathy for Job's sufferings has often been noted.[7] Is this just accidental? Scarcely. It might, indeed, be thought that this peculiar fact favors the view that Eliphaz was completely hostile to Job from the start. But this by no means necessarily follows. Eliphaz might easily fear that an expression of sympathy on his part would be understood by Job to condone his complaints, the last thing Eliphaz wished to suggest. It is very clear that the alienation between Job and his Friends begins, not with any misconstruction by them of his past life (see again 4 1—8), but with their criticism of his speech. Eliphaz could not bring himself to pass over in silence what seemed to him to be so dangerously near to blasphemy. At this point he felt himself entirely in the right. And hence he was led, most unfortunately, to omit all words for Job's misfortunes which might compromise the rebuke he thought it necessary to administer. But this does not mean that Eliphaz already secretly believed in Job's guilt and that his consolations were insincerely offered. The author may have intended to suggest another thing by the failure of Eliphaz at this point. A deep and understanding sympathy would have compelled him to face the problem presented by the extent of Job's suffering more frankly than he wished to do. As a matter of fact he sought to avoid this problem. To implicate Job only in the general sin of mankind (4 12—21), though it was done with a kindly purpose, was to dodge the real issue. This explanation did not fit Job's case at all. If he shared only in the general sin of the race, why was he visited with such unusual and terrible suffering? Pain as acute as his was not the common lot of mortals. Job's ear did not fail to note this dissonance and his reply to Eliphaz on this head in Chapter 6 was crushing. The same lack of any real relevance to Job's case is found in the consolatory conclusion of the speech. Here, also, there is only broad generalization, expressed very beautifully, it is true, but without any sense of reality. The well-meant explanation of Job's suffering by the theory of chastisement at 5 17ff. was robbed of its intended effect by the preceding unfortunate statements in 5 2—5 which only alienated Job. And what good would it do Job to be told that he would be redeemed from famine and war? And the reference to the slanderer's tongue, why bring that in? It is, indeed, at first sight so incongruous that some scholars have sought to emend the text to get rid of it. But may it not be intended to show to what lengths a man of Eliphaz's mentality could go in the way of irrelevance? Incidentally, the Dialogue was to show that the Friends themselves were slandering Job. Did the author have this in mind and was this reference to Eliphaz's promise of safety from slander an ironical fling by the author himself at the fatuous character of Eliphaz's consolations? This must certainly be the case in what follows. It was a lovely picture to look at which Eliphaz painted, of Job's homestead with nothing missing in it, of his fields without stones, his numerous progeny (one can almost see Job wince at the allusion) and his harvest home in the mellowness of old age. But was not his home blasted? Were not his children slain? Was not he, himself, afflicted with an incurable disease? Comfort which does not flow from any real understanding of the situation is vain, however well-meant or beautifully expressed. In such circumstances kindness is ineffectual and consolations become irrelevant. That all these dissonances are actually in this introductory speech of Eliphaz is conclusively proved from Job's reply in Chapter 6 and 7 which points them out.[8]

---

[7] Cf. De., Di., Da., Volz, Ball.

Thus in conclusion, we are to see in Eliphaz an aged, dignified, well-meaning man, dominated by the current doctrine of retribution, who wishes to spare Job's feelings and comfort him, but is able to do neither the one nor the other because he is a doctrinaire, unable to sense the tragic realities of life. He is not a malignant person. He is not hiding his real feelings toward Job under a mantle of hypocritical sympathy while indulging in bitter asides at his expense. He is simply a rather stupid good person, blundering into words that would cut Job to the quick because he did not have a sufficiently sympathetic imagination to realize what impression he was likely to make by them. So interpreted, the speech reveals a double character exactly as the Prologue does. On the surface Eliphaz appears to be in the right, not only in kindly minimizing Job's responsibilities for his present plight, not only in his well-meant consolations, but also in the merited rebuke of the temper of Job's speech. The average orthodox reader would heartily approve of Eliphaz. There can be no doubt of that. But on closer investigation and when listened to with the ear of Job, the speech of Eliphaz is found to be hopelessly in the wrong. The subtlety of it lies in its irony and innuendo. But these are not the irony and innuendo of Eliphaz at the expense of Job but the irony and innuendo of the author at the expense of Eliphaz and of the orthodox reader whose position he represents.[9]

---

[8] It might be supposed that the more or less conventional promises in 5 12—26 are the usual verbiage with which Oriental poets delight to adorn their pages, and hence that the author himself is not aware of the irrelevancies which he is putting into the mouth of Eliphaz. But if we study the speeches of Job in the Dialogue we do not find, except in a few critically doubtful passages, such irrelevancies. In Job's speeches the poet hews to the line with a concentrated power that is amazing. Hence it seems fair to conclude that when the author does introduce irrelevant material in the speeches of the Friends he intends to do so. In the case of the author of Job we are dealing with a great poetical genius, and we are bound to interpret his work from this point of view and not reduce him to the level of an ordinary oriental poet. Oriental he is, but a great Oriental.

---

[9] A careful examination of the Commentators reveals the fact that there has been little systematic attempt to relate the different parts of the speech of Eliphaz, with their varying moods, to each other, and this in spite of the fact that the artistic nature of the speech is much insisted upon. In general the Commentators may be divided into two main groups: (1) Those who see in Eliphaz a sincere and well-meaning friend of Job whose consolations, though somewhat irrelevant and given without a sufficiently sympathetic understanding of the situation, are nevertheless honestly meant (Hitz., De., Da., Du., Peake, Bu., Dr., Volz, Steuer., Bart.), (2) Those who see in Eliphaz a secret enemy of Job whose consolations are more or less hypocritical (Ew., Di., Jast., Bt., Ball; König may also be grouped with these because of his view of 4 6—11, though he does not formally discuss the question). Duhm is the most consistent exponent of the first view and Buttenwieser the most uncompromising advocate of the second. Within the two poles of opinion represented by these two men there all sorts of shadings and conflicting interpretations of details. The first group of scholars relies mainly upon 4 2—7 and 5 8—26 for the support of their view, the second group upon 4 8—11 and 5 2—5. The most important line of cleavage between the two

IV. Explanatory Comments.

4 2. *Essay a word.* The verb usually means "prove" in the sense of "test." Yet cf. Dt. 4 34 (EV., "assay"); 28 56 (EV., "adventure") for the meaning "essay" or "attempt." In these two cases the verb is followed by the infinitive, and possibly it would be safer to change דָּבָר (a word) to דַּבֵּר (to speak).[10] Yet the verb in the sense of "test" takes a direct object at Eccl. 7 23 and may do so here. Eliphaz begins with a polite apology. Further emendations, especially those based on the reading נשא for נסה in Aq., Sym., Th., Syr., (e. g. Be., Du., K.) are quite unnecessary. G.'s paraphrase is certainly not to be followed.

Take it ill. Lit. "be weary," and then "impatient;" cf. the use of the noun at Mal. 1 13, "what a bore!"

4 6. *Religion.* Lit. "fear," an abbreviation for "fear of God" (RV.) which is often a synonym for "religion." Cf. Ps. 19 9 (10) where "fear of Jaweh" is in parallelism with Law, Precepts, Commandments, and refers, like them, to the Religion of Israel as an objective fact and not simply to a subjective experience. When religion is called "the fear of God," the sense of awe or reverence is emphasized. Without this quality no religion in any deeper sense can exist. This conception of religion is fundamental in the theology of the Friends and is a true element in it which must be reckoned with. However, such fear is quite compatible with joy. "The fear of the Lord is glory and exultation and gladness and a crown of rejoicing," sings the Son of Sirach, 1 11ff. and Faber describes God in one of his *Hymns of Childhood* as "my welcome fear at night." The saints have never shrunk from the idea of the "fear of God."

Should not. The EV. and the great majority of modern commentators translate by the present indicative and this is grammatically more correct,

---

groups is in their respective criticism and interpretation of 4 8—11. The one group construes 8 by vv. 9—11 as a very pointed warning to Job, whose guilt Eliphaz assumes from the start and therefore feels it necessary to threaten him. The other group is divided. Some of them seek to interpret vv. 8—11 in the light of the kindly expressed introduction in vv. 2—7 and therefore infer that it was Eliphaz's intention to exclude Job from the threats in vv. 8—11. In this case vv. 8—11 are also considered to be intended as consolatory. Others of this group prefer to regard either all or part of vv. 8—11 as secondary. In either case it is possible to hold that Eliphaz at the start assumes the essential goodness of Job though he is undoubtedly alarmed by his speeches. The interpretation of the speech given above follows this last method of attack upon its problems, but by the retention of v. 8 and its interpretation as intentionally consolatory it is believed new beauty and new subtlety in this first speech of the Friends are revealed. For details see Explanatory Comments.

[10] Bu. after Aq., Th., V.

but the implication is that Job should find comfort in what he possesses. The translation by the past tense (Mx., Bu., Jast., Bt.) seems to be due to a disinclination to admit that Eliphaz could recognize Job's virtues in the present.

The differences in the translation of v. 6 in AV. and RV. are probably due to a difficulty in the Hebrew text which reads as if there were three predicates: Is not thy fear thy confidence, thy hope and (!) the blamelessness of thy ways?

The construction of the ו, "and" as the ו of the apodosis (K.) is harsh. Either remove "thy hope" to the end of the sentence, in strict parallelism of form with the first line (Mx., Du.), or place "and" before "thy hope," cf. the italicised "and" in RV. which follows G. and Syr., and five Hebrew manuscripts (so Di., Bu., Be. alternatively, Dr., Ball), or omit it altogether (Volz). The AV.'s rendering with its introduction of "this" without any clearly defined antecedent is clearly incorrect. G.'s reading of v. 5 is interesting:

> Is not thy fear foolishness (*ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ*),
> And thy hope, and the evil (*ἡ κακία*) of thy way?

This implies a blunt attack upon Job's character which anticipates later developments in the Dialogue but is entirely inappropriate in this opening speech of the Friends. The Hebrew word כסלתך, translated by "confidence" in EV. and "foolishness" in G., is found only here with certainty (Ps. 85 8 (9) is a questionable text) but is the equivalent of כסל which has both these meanings ("foolishness" in the one certain passage, Eccl. 7 25; "confidence" at Job 8 14, 31 24, Prov. 3 26, Ps. 78 7; at Ps. 49 13 (14) both renderings have been given, cf. RV. text and mg). G. has adopted the rarer meaning, "foolishness." How did it come to do this? It is just possible that the answer to this question may be found in the next line. Here *κακία*, "evil," has been substituted for the Hebrew תם, "blamelessness." Beer holds that this represents the original text in G., but more probably it is due to a corruption of an original *ἡ ἀκακία* (Ball) which is still preserved in Holmes-Parsons 157 and noted in Field. In favor of this latter view is the fact that *ἀκακία* along with *ἄκακος* is G.'s equivalent for derivatives of the Hebrew root תמם, in a considerable number of instances in Job, Psalms and Proverbs (cf. Job 27 5, 31 6, and especially 2 3, to which, along with 1 1, 8, our present passage is an allusion). If *κακία* is a text corruption it must be a very ancient one, for the conjectured original appears in but one manuscript. This ancient corruption might then be responsible for the translation of כסלתך by "foolishness." The wide-spread character of the corruption was favored by the tendency to import into this first speech of Eliphaz the mood of his subsequent speeches, a tendency reflected in V. (Where is thy fear, thy courage, thy patience and the perfection of thy ways?) and many modern commentaries (see also below at v. 12).

4 7. The words "thy religion," "blameless," "innocent," "upright" in

vv. 6 and 7 are intended to remind of 1 1, 8; 2 3. The characterization of Job by the author and Jahweh in the Prologue is here echoed by Eliphaz. Eliphaz is, of course, not aware of the coincidence. But it is clearly the intention of the author to put the earlier encomium of Job into the mouth of Eliphaz also, and by this device to suggest that Eliphaz's recognition of Job's piety was an honest one, not ironical as König maintains. This in turn implies that v. 7 was also spoken in order to comfort, not to warn as König again holds (cf. Dillmann's characterization of v. 7 as "double edged"). The ancient Jewish interpretation of vv. 6 and 7 as intentionally "injurious" to Job (Baba Meṣi‘a 58b, cited in Moore, *Judaism*, II, p. 147), which, along with the present tense in v. 6 (see above), seems to have influenced König, is certainly mistaken. Vv. 2—7 are honestly and kindly meant. They include a rebuke, it is true, but this is natural under the circumstances and it is not at all harsh (see Interpretation).

4 8. *Evil*, as RV. at Jer. 4 15. The Hebrew word, '*awen*, may be used of the sin or wickedness that leads to misfortune[11] or to the misfortune itself which results from sin.[12] On the other hand the Hebrew word, ‘amal, translated "harm," never in itself refers to sin. Yet occasionally, as here, it refers to the injury or harm done to others as at Ps. 7 16 (17): "His mischief (‘amal, i. e. the harm that he does to others) shall return upon his own head and his violence upon his own pate"[13] (RV.). We might expect at Job 4 8 that it would be explicitly said, as at Prov. 22 8, that "they that plow iniquity (‘*avlah*) shall reap calamity ('*awen*)."[14] But in the current doctrine of retribution sin is thought of as so inherent in trouble that the one meaning almost imperceptibly shades off into the other in 'awen. I have chosen "evil" and "harm" as suggesting the moral taint that was found in misfortune.[15] The rhythm in v. 8 is awkward as there is no caesura between the two lines. Since there is no defect in the thought or expression, this awkwardness would seem to be an intentional variation. If we examine the stanza arrangement of vv. 2—8, it would seem best to separate v. 2 from what follows as an introductory couplet.[16] This permits vv. 3—8 to fall into three beautifully constructed quatrains:

[11] Jer. 4 14 (RV., "evil" in sense of "sinful"); Ps. 36 3 (4), 66 18, Prov. 19 28 (RV., "iniquity"); Prov. 17 4 (RV., "wicked").

[12] Jer. 4 15 (RV., "evil" in the sense of "misfortune"); Prov. 12 21 (RV., "mischief"); Prov. 22 8 (RV., "calamity").

[13] Cf. Hab. 1 3.

[14] Cf. also, for the thought, Hos. 8 7; 10 13.

[15] G. has for 'awen and ‘amal *τὰ ἄτοπα* and *ὀδύνας*. The former word is found 5 (6 ?) times in Job, once in Prov., and once in II Macc. It is used four times in these places for 'awen. The latter Greek word is used for 28 different Hebrew words, but only three times for ‘amal, all in Job, 4 8; 7 3; 15 35. The first of these words is thus a mark of G.'s style.

[16] So Volz. Hitzig separates it in thought, though not in the stanza arrangement, from what follows.

a) vv. 3, 4, Job's attitude in the past toward the sufferings of others; b) vv. 5, 6, by contrast, his very questionable attitude toward his own sufferings in the present— a quatrain made up of two antithetic couplets; c) vv. 7, 8, the great doctrine of rewards and punishments which should be his support at such a time as this, again expressed in two antithetic couplets. In this quatrain the major promise of the friends is announced in both its consolatory and minatory aspects. For the propriety of v. 8 in its present position, see Interpretation.

4 9, 10—11. The quatrain in vv. 10, 11, is an effective description of the breakup of the lion's den.

> (Hark to) the roar of the lion, the growl of the king of beasts,
> The teeth of the young lion are dashed out,
> The lion perishes for lack of prey,
> The lion's cubs are scattered.

It is impossible to translate the five synonyms for lion in this stanza without becoming pedantic. The language of the desert is full of such synonyms. In the vast general uniformity of it the mind seems to find relief in fine discriminations. The lion is usually taken to represent the powerful and violent sinner who will finally be overthrown. This must be the meaning if the stanza is an original part of the context. In that case we have here, not a simile, but a metaphor, the interpretation of which is left to the reader's imagination. But the context certainly does not stimulate his imagination to this interpretation. There is no emphasis in the context upon the power or violence of the wicked man. Job was, indeed, powerful in the days of his prosperity, but he was certainly not violent. He may have been violent as he later sat on his dunghill and complained of his lot, but he was assuredly not powerful. Again, the change of figure from sowing-time and harvest in v. 8 to that of the lion's den in vv. 10f. is abrupt in the extreme and is unmediated by v. 9. The same figure of the crippled lion in less elaborated form underlies 29 17 (a doubtful verse); Ps. 3 7 (8); 58 6 (7). Vv. 10f. may well be a more fully worked-out form of this metaphor, either composed by some commentator to emphasize the warning in v. 8, or, more probably, cited from some other source for the same purpose by some copyist who wrote it originally on the margin. The quatrain is rejected by an increasing number of scholars.[17] Duhm has also suggested the deletion of v. 9:

> By the breath of God they perish,
> By the blast (lit. wind) of his anger they are consumed.

This verse cannot be combined with the perfectly rounded quatrain, vv. 10 to 11, without destroying its intentional symmetry. But the result would be equally unfortunate if v. 9 were attached to vv. 7—8 which, as we have seen, also forms an excellent quatrain, intended to express in classic form the great doctrine of the Friends. The artistic effect of this quatrain would be distinctly weakened by such an addition. It may be added that v. 9 is a rather vague generalization. Are the breath and wind of God figures of anything in particular? Scholars who make any comment on the verse at all usually see in it an allusion to the withering of the wicked as herbage withers under the sirocco, the hot wind of God.[18] In that case v. 9 is not quite homogeneous with v. 8. In v. 8 there is to be a harvest of a sort; in v. 9 there is to be no harvest at all. But this argument by itself would have little weight.[19] The fact, however, that v. 9 is wedged in between two excellent quatrains, to neither of which it can be attached without destroying its effectiveness, is a real objection to this verse.

---

[17] Mx., Sieg., Du., Jast.

Duhm, followed by Schmidt, goes so far as to reject v. 8 also, against which he urges its unrhythmical character and its contextual difficulty. But the contextual difficulty, as shown above, is no real difficulty. On the other hand, the rejection of v. 8 requires a rearrangement of the quatrains in vv. 1—7 far less satisfactory than the one proposed above and sacrifices the full statement of the doctrine of retribution which it is the deliberate purpose of the author to put into the mouth of Eliphaz in this, the opening speech of the Friends. If it were not certain that the book of Job was subjected to a later revision on a large scale in the interest of orthodoxy, the doubts of the originality of vv. 9, 10—11 might not carry conviction. But when once the resolution is taken to eliminate these verses as a premature emphasis upon the thought of v. 8 in a dogmatic interest, the movement of thought in this first speech of Eliphaz and the real intention of its author in its composition can be much more easily understood.[20]

---

[18] Cf. Hos. 13 15; Is. 40 7. So Di., Da., Du., Bart., and especially Dr.

[19] Jastrow translates "breath" and "blast" by "wrath" and "anger," cf. Ps. 18 15 (16) = II Sam. 22 16. But whether the Hebrew word for breath, נשמה, can, by itself, mean wrath is questionable. It is used again of anger only in the Psalm passage just cited, but there it is accompanied by "nostrils," "the breath of thy nostrils."

[20] See Interpretation. The poetical structure of 4 2—11 is much disputed. The older commentators incline to divide the section into two strophes, vv. 2—6 and vv. 7—11, each of ten lines (Ew., Hitz., Di.), but with no attempt to further divide into quatrains. On the basis of these arrangements it is noticeable that, while vv. 7 and 8 can be taken together as contrasted with what precedes, yet, if vv. 9—11 are retained, the whole emphasis of the second strophe would fall upon the warning in v. 8, of which vv. 9—11 would be an elaboration, not upon the hope in v. 7. The result is to isolate v. 7 in a measure and to combine v. 8 with vv. 9—11. Again, vv. 2—11 have been divided according to the supposed sequence of thought into two sections, vv. 2—5 and vv. 6—11, i. e. 8×12 (so De., Bu., Dr., Ball, K.) or,

4 12. *Whisper.* A doubtful word. It occurs again only at 26 14; yet cf. Ex. 32 25. The meaning "whisper," (so RV.) follows Sym. and V. "A little" (AV., cf. "inkling," Jastrow) follows Targ., Syr., and the mediaeval Jewish tradition. If "whisper" is adopted, this does not mean that only a part of the revelation was heard, but that it came to Eliphaz as a whisper, as a faint and far off sound. This seems more in line with the parallelism and the following context, generally, which emphasizes the mystery of the revelation. G. has *ἐξαίσια*, "portentous" or "ominous" things. This is a pure guess, but shows that the translator had a feeling for the passage. There seems to have been another attempt to translate the verse in *G.*:

> If there had been any word of truth in thy speeches,
> No one of these evils (G^A) would have befallen thee.

The first line with its mistaken reading of אולי for ואלי corresponds to v. 12a. The *οὐθὲν* of the second line probably reads אין for אזני and ותקר for ותקח and takes שמץ in the sense of "little" (cf. Be., Dr., and Ball with varying suggestions). At 26 14 the word is translated by *ἰκμάδα*, "moisture" (cf. Jer. 17 8, the only other occurence of the word in G.) and then "drop" as something very little.

The result is a curious but interesting perversion of the passage. It seeks to account for Job's sufferings by his speeches. But this is just what Eliphaz does not do at this stage of the Debate.

omitting vv. 10—11, into 8×8 (Mx.). The tendency of this arrangement is to combine vv. 6—7 together and vv. 8—11, in other words to separate vv. 7 and 8. This comes out very clearly in Ball's quatrain arrangement which is based on Duhm's: vv. 2—3; 4—5; 6—7; 8—9; 10—11. But thus to wrench apart vv. 7 and 8 is against all probability, for when combined they form a natural quatrain in which the doctrine of retribution finds a classical formulation. On all the above theories which retain vv. 8—11 it is further noteworthy that this first part of the speech closes with a most emphatic warning which fairly smothers the consolatory suggestion of v. 7 and is quite unexpected after the introductory verses. Hence Duhm, as we have seen (cf. also Schmidt), rejects vv. 8—11 and arranges vv. 2—7 in the series of quatrains later followed by Ball. By this means he eliminates the note of warning altogether, but again at the expense of separating vv. 7 and 8. But, as I believe, it is only when these two verses are taken together (so, most precisely, Hitz. and Da.) and v. 2 is separated from what follows as an introductory couplet, that a quatrain arrangement, which at the same time serves to clarify the thought most fully, can be obtained. The quatrain, vv. 7—8, contains, it is true, a warning, but if vv. 9—11 are rejected, the warning is not so predominant in this first part of the speech as it is in its present form. The bearing of all this upon the interpretation of the speech as a whole is important.

4 13. *Thoughts confused and vague.* A paraphrase of a doubtful word, שׂעפּים.

It is found again in this form only at 20 2, in a slightly different form (שׂרעפּי) at Ps. 94 19, 139 23. It is connected by some scholars with an Arabic root "to excite," "disquiet," hence anxious, or troubled thoughts;[21] by others with a root of slightly different form (סעף) "to cleave," "divide," "branch," from which the noun, "branches," comes.[22] The paraphrase follows the latter derivation and suggests the blurred and indistinct impression which comes at the outset of this supernatural experience. "Thoughts" (T. and EV.) is too colorless a word. The verb, "yield" paraphrases the preposition "from" (EV.) in its sense of source or origin. To delete the preposition,[23] or to change it to ו ("and")[24] is quite unnecessary, in spite of the imitation at 33 15, where "dream" takes the place of "confused thoughts" and the preposition is omitted.

Trance more deep than sleep. The Hebrew word (תרדמה), thus paraphrased and found again in Job at 33 15, is usually employed of a trance condition induced by supernatural influences. Cf. Gen. 2 21, I. Sam. 26 12, Is. 29 10, and especially at Gen. 15 12 where it is directly connected, as in Job, with a revelation. The verb is used in the same sense of "trance" at Dan. 8 18; 10 9, and very effectively at Jonah 1 5f. (cf. Is. 29 10), in a chapter whose atmosphere is saturated with the supernatural and the mysterious.[25] At Ps. 76 6 (7) the verb is used of the sleep of death which, through God's agency, overcame the Egyptians. At Jd. 4 21, Prov. 10 5 and 19 15 the word (noun or verb) is used more generally of a very sound sleep. It is interesting to observe how the Versions also feel the connotation of the mysterious and the supernatural which the word possesses. At Gen. 2 21 and 15 12 G., and at Is. 29 10 Th. reads ecstacy (ἔκστασις). At Job 4 13 and 33 15 G. reads "fear" (φόβος) and "dreadful fear" (δεινὸς φόβος) and Th. at 33 15 again "ecstacy." Compare also the use of "stupor" (θάμβος) from Jahweh' at I Sam. 26 12 and the same root as a verb in the A. text of Th. at Dan. 8 18. In view of all this it seems much better in this connection to take תרדמה of a supernatural trance than, as Budde and König do, of a natural though heavy sleep.

4 14. *Dread and quaking.* Hendiadys for a shuddering dread. Cf. Prov. 29 15. The second line of v. 14 is uncertain. Lit. "The multitude of my

---

[21] BDB, Ges-Buhl, Du., K. (?). This seems to be the view of G. ("fear"), Sym. (panic, ἐν ἐκπλήξει), V. (horror).

[22] Hitz., Di., Bu., Be., Dr., Jast. ("play of thoughts"), Ball, cf. Aq. (ἐν παραλλαγαῖς, alternations, changes).

[23] Hitz., Ehr.

[24] Be.

[25] G.'s translation in Jonah by "snore" (ἔρεγχεν) is quite out of keeping with the spirit of the chapter.

bones it filled with dread." "Multitude" (רב) is regularly taken as the poetical equivalent of "all," though this is doubtful. Further, to say that dread or shuddering dread filled with dread (the hiph., הפּחיד is found only here) is not good usage in Hebrew. Ehrlich proposes to read ריב for רב and to give it the sense of "doubt" or "anxiety" which it sometimes has in Arabic—"Doubt filled my bones with dread." G. reads "shook" (*διέσεισεν*) which may point to an original החיל, cf. G.'s *συνσείσει* for יחיל at Ps. 29 8—"Doubt shook my bones." Interesting, but G., T. and V. support רב. The translation adopted is a somewhat loose paraphrase of the present Hebrew text.[26] The general thought is clear enough. The verse intends to suggest the feeling of uncanniness which precedes the vision itself.

4 15. *A breath of air.* "Wind" (רוח),[27] like the wind at I K. 19 11. The Hebrew word is not to be translated "spirit,"[28] for it is never used as *πνεῦμα* is used at Luke 24 37 or Acts 23 9 of an apparition. This faint breath is not a part of the vision, but is a premonitory sign of what is to follow—a breath from the supernatural world.[29]

Hasteth by, brushing my face. This is an attempt to convey the probable meaning or at least the feeling of the original. The Hebrew verb, חלף, translated "hasteth by," has various shades of meaning. As a verb of motion it is found only in poetry except at I Sam. 10 3, and several times in parallelism with עבר, the usual Hebrew word for "passing by,[30] and so it is understood in the present passage by T., which translates it by עבר, Syr. and V.[31] But חלף, unlike עבר, clearly has at times the sense of speed attached to it, as at Job 9 11; 9 26, where it is parallel to "dart" and describes the swift passing of the light reed-boats on the Nile; 20 24, where it probably describes the swift arrow which hurtles after and overtakes a fugitive;[32] Is. 8 8 and

---

[26] Cf. Volz's similar paraphrase.

[27] So commentators generally.

[28] AV., RV. txt., Ew., Bt., K., Du. Duhm's reason is that רוח is here masc. as at I K. 22 21. But it is also masc. at Job 8 2 where the reference is unquestionably to the wind.

[29] For the meaning, "wind," whether strong or gentle, cf. Mx., Di., Bu., Steuer., Volz, Dr., Jast., Ball. The line in the Gilgamish epic: The shade of Enkidu he permitted to rise out of the earth like a breath of air, is therefore slightly different from our present passage (Gressmann, *Texte u. Bilder*, II, p. 185.).

[30] So at Job 9 11, Is. 8 8, Songs 2 11, Hab. 1 11 (uncertain passage). At Is. 24 5 it is parallel to עבר in the sense of "transgress." The same change of shading in both words in this last passage shows their close connection.

[31] The *ἐπῆλθεν* of G., though this compound is used only here for חלף (*παρέρχεσθαι* at 9 11a, G.'s usual translation of עבר, *ἀπέρχεσθαι* at I Sam. 10 3 and Songs 2 11) seems also to take it in the sense of "pass by" as it is frequently used for עבר.

[32] See Moore on Judges 5 26.

21 1, where it is used of the Euphrates sweeping through Judah and the whirlwinds sweeping through the South.[33] At Job 9 11 and here the context also suggests an element of furtiveness in the swiftness of the passing. The wind at Job 4 15 is not a great storm-wind as at Is. 21 1 or I K. 19 11, but, in accordance with the muted character of the entire passage, a mere breath of air, a draught, hasting by. What, now, is the force of the following prepositional phrase על פני? Nowhere else is חלף followed by a preposition, for the עם of comparison at 9 26 is no real exception. If *ruah* meant a spirit or apparition, then undoubtedly the following phrase, על פני, would mean, as it often does, "before me."[34] But if ruah means "wind," this translation is by no means so obvious. Eliphaz wishes to say that he became aware of a wind. But how did he become aware of it? He could not see it. Nor did he become aware of it by observing its effects. Nothing is said of any observed effects (contrast I K. 19 11). He *felt* it. Hence the very similar phraseology at Ex. 33 19 in which על פניך after עבר is translated "before thee"[35] is not determinative for Job 4 15. But if Eliphaz felt the wind, then it is altogether probable that פני in the phrase על פני is not part of the prepositional phrase in the sense of "before me," but refers to the actual face of Eliphaz.[36] That פנים preceded by על may, on occasion, refer to the actual face is clear from such passages as Ex. 34 33, 35; II K. 4 29, 8 15; Is. 25 8. But the exact force of על is not quite certain. "By my face," as at I K. 9 8; Jer. 22 8 and I K. 19 19 (reading עליו for אליו), in all three cases preceded by עבר, hardly fits, for, as we have seen, the wind is felt. "Over my face" is better, as at Gen. 8 1 or, more exactly still, at Nu. 6 5 and 8 7, in all of which cases עבר is again used.[37] The idea is that, as the wind hasted by, Eliphaz felt it on his face.

The hair of my head. Lit. "a hair of my flesh." The construction of the second line in v. 15 is uncertain though the general meaning is clear. The word שערה is used elsewhere only of a single hair. If it is emended to the plural,[38] this conflicts with the singular verb of which it is supposed to be the subject.[39] If, on the other hand, it is taken as the object of the verb, the *pi'el* being now given a transitive force, then the subject of the verb must be ruah ("It, the wind, makes the hairs of my flesh to bristle up").

---

[33] The idea of a swift passing in חלף easily passes over into that of a sudden vanishing or disappearance, as at Is. 2 18, Songs 2 11.

[34] So Ew., Hitz., Di., Du., Volz, Steuer.

[35] G. *πρότερός σου.*

[36] Bd., Dr., Ehr., Ball, Jast. This is probably also intended by G.'s *πρόσοπόν μου.*

[37] This seems to be the view of G. which translates Job 4 15 by *ἐπῆλθεν ἐπὶ*, exactly as at Nu. 6 5 and 8 7.

[38] Dr., Ball.

[39] תסמר (bristle up) occurs again only at Ps. 119 120 where it is an intransitive Ḳal.

But ruah is in this passage masc., whereas the verb is fem.[40] Under the circumstances my freer paraphrase is perfectly justifiable. The interpretation by T., followed by Mx., of שערה, a hair, as the equivalent of סערה, a storm-wind, on the mistaken supposition that it is in parallelism with wind (ruah), is against all the other ancient Versions and the general context and is probably due to the influence of I K. 19 11. The change of tense from the past in v. 14 to the vivid historical presents in vv. 15f. is noteworthy.

4 16. *I feel a presence.* Lit. "it stands." The subject is intentionally indefinite, cf. τίς of Sym. and quidam of V. The first person, "I stood," of G., Aq., and Syr. is certainly incorrect. The Hebrew expressly refers to the objective though undefined ("it") presence and only suggests the uncanny impression which it makes. The paraphrase emphasizes the subjective impression rather than the objective appearance.

Semblance. (תמונה, "image," AV.) Cf. for this word Dt. 4 12, 15, 16, 25; Ex. 20 4 (Dt. 5 8), in all of which passages G. has ὁμοίωμα (likeness). It occurs again only at Nu. 12 8 and Ps. 17 15, in both of which instances G. has, because of theological timidity, substituted "glory," and in our present passage, where G. has μορφὴ ("form," RV.). It has been remarked that the word is found only in connection with God or with something to be worshipped. It suggests the undefinable and mysterious just as the word דמות does at Ezek. 1 26; [41] not the supernal thing itself, only its dim and shadowy likeness that, as it were, comes like a veil between the observer and the divine reality. The word thus emphasizes positively what the preceding line expresses negatively. What Eliphaz sees is objective yet impalpable.[42]

And through the stillness. The paraphrase seeks to draw out the real meaning of the more forcible, pregnant construction of the Hebrew: "Stillness and a voice I hear."[43] The sound is as impalpable as the sight. The physical sensations of sight and sound are sublimated until they almost vanish into a world of pure spirit. One hears stillness, sees what is but a semblance of a shape. To reject "stillness" as a gloss out of I K. 19 12, as one commentator has proposed to do, shows a lack of imagination appalling to think of in an interpreter of Job. The allusion to "the still small voice" of Elijah's vision at Horeb is, indeed, quite certain in spite of the slight change of expression; our author varies it in his own way. The great and strong wind which Elijah saw shattering the rocks is now subdued to the faintest breath of air, in keeping with the remainder of the description. The literary allusions in vv. 12—16 to the passages in I K. 19 and Gen. 15 12 (less certainly to the theophanies at Ex. 33 17—23; 34 5ff.) would add greatly to the power and beauty of these verses for the ancient reader. Jonah is similarly a past master in the art of literary allusion. It is sad to think that the general ignorance of the Bible at the present time, which seems to increase with the increasing output of our Bible Societies, makes it necessary for a commentator explicitly to point out such allusions. In this connection it may not be amiss to remind the reader of the beautiful paraphrase of our present passage in the last of Byron's Hebrew Melodies, *A spirit passed before me.* In vv. 12—13 there is an excellent quatrain introductory to the vision, in vv. 14—15 a quatrain descriptive of the uncanny effect of the supernatural experience into which Eliphaz is entering. In v. 16, which seeks to describe the almost indescribable character of the vision itself, we would expect another quatrain. But there are now only three lines. There is no indication that the thought is incomplete, nor any evidence of a corrupted text. Duhm suggests that the first line in v. 16 is intentionally abbreviated in order to concentrate attention upon the mystery of this intangible presence and thus secures a quatrain. This is a rather daring suggestion, but the formal and rhetorical beauty of the poem is enhanced by it and it has been followed in the translation.

---

[40] Yet cf. 1 19 and I K. 19 11, where ruah is both masc. and fem. in the same sentence.

[41] Cf. תבנית parallel to תמונה at Dt. 4 16.

[42] G. I saw and there was no form before my eyes,
But a breath of air (αὔραν) and a voice I heard.

G. under the influence of Dt. 4 12 draws a distinction between the "semblance" or "form" which is not seen and the voice which is heard, clearly incorrectly.

[43] G., a breath of air and a voice; Sym., stillness of a voice; V., a voice of a gentle breath of air (aurae lenis).

4 17. *Mortal man.* Heb. אנוש, often, as here, with the idea of frailty attached. G., *βροτός*.

Earth-born man. Heb. גבר. While this word is used at times in prose connections, it is of special frequence in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Lamentations, above all in Job. It may therefore be regarded as mainly a poetical equivalent for the usual Hebrew words for man, איש or אדם. I have inserted "earth-born" for the sake of the parallelism and the context, though the word etymologically refers to the strong male (G. *ἀνήρ*, here and regularly in Job used as the equivalent of גבר) as opposed to the female.

In God's sight. From God's point of view. This translation follows G., RV.mg., and the majority of modern commentators, as against the translation by the comparative (AV., RV.txt., Hitz., K. after T. and V.). The first translation involves a very rare usage of the preposition מן (only at 35 2; Nu. 32 22, G. *ἔναντι Κυρίου* in both cases; cf. also Jer. 51 5, G., *ἀπό*; Gen. 38 26, G., *ἢ ἐγώ*) but is greatly favored by the following context which emphasizes the sharpness of the difference between God and man. The second translation is grammatically simpler but involves a gross exaggeration and is opposed by the following verses.

The brief, powerful couplet, v. 17, is best taken by itself as the oracle and what follows as its elaboration.[44] V. 17 is of great importance in this first speech of Eliphaz. It implicates Job in sin, but in the gentlest possible way. All men are sinners and hence Job must be one also. Eliphaz will not charge Job with any specific sin that might account for his sufferings. The whole passage, therefore, vv. 12—17, which culminates in the oracle is altogether kindly in its intentions.[45]

---

[44] Du., Jast., and compare the comments of Hitz., Ew., and Dr. The

4 18. *Error.* תׇּהֳלָה. The word is found only here and is uncertain. The ancient Versions are quite at a loss. Possibly to be explained out of the Ethiopic as "error" (Di., Bart., K.). Possibly to be emended to תִּפְלָה, "unseemliness" or "folly" (so Mx., Bu.), cf. the identical phrase at 24 12, though the text there is uncertain, and cf. also 1 22; or it is possibly to be emended to תְּהִלָּה and, regarding the negative of v. a as also governing v. b, translate: "He imputeth nothing praiseworthy to his messengers" (so Ehr. and Ball, apparently independently of each other, but against the ancient versions which do not recognize a negative in v. b, cf. K.).

4 19. *What then shall be said of those.* This paraphrase answers to a certain lack of precision in the style at this point. The Hebrew word, אַף, which must be equivalent to the regular phrase אַף כִּי, means "how much more" after a positive sentence (cf. Prov. 11 31; 15 11) and "how much less" after a negative one (cf. Job 15 16; 25 6). But here both a positive and negative sentence precede. It is interesting to notice that AV. reads "how much less" and RV. after Syr., Sym., Targ. and V. read "how much more" (G. is quite different). The commentators divide along the same lines though the majority read "how much more."[46]

Whose housing's clay. Lit., "who inhabit clay houses." This is probably to be taken figuratively for human bodies, not literally (as Hitz.) of the frail mud huts of the peasantry, though it is possible that these may have been in the author's mind when he thought of the human body. The next

---

characterization of this splendid passage, vv. 12—17, by Professor Jastrow as "rather ridiculous" and "banal" is certainly to be deplored as coming from a scholar usually so keen and stimulating.

[45] Cf. especially De., Da., Dr. for this interpretation of the passage. It seems to be overlooked by other commentators. Jast. goes so far as to call v. 17 a "stinging rebuke" of Job!

[46] So De., Du., Bu., Dr., Schmidt, Jast., Bt., K. The advantage of Ehrlich's and Ball's emendation is that both clauses are negative and hence "how much less" becomes the proper translation. *Geschweige denn* (Ew., Bu., Di.) has also the lack of precision of the original. Ewald interprets it as (cf. Di., and AV. at 9 14) equivalent to "how much less" and so, apparently, Dillmann. Budde has "how much more". At 9 14 the phrase is usually translated as "how much less" as also at 15 16 and 25 6—the only other passages in which it is found in Job. The preceding clause at 9 14 is positive in form but negative in meaning and equivalent to "Even the helpers of Rahab are not able to oppose him, much less could I ****."

clause, "whose foundation is in the dust," certainly has in mind man's origin out of the dust.[47] But there is no direct allusion to the story of the Fall in Genesis (cf. Du.). The sin of man is impliedly connected with or a part of his frailty, not the result of his fall. The fact that man's frailty rather than his sinfulness is mentioned after v. 17 is at first sight curious, but the assumed premise is that the creatureliness of man as contrasted with God is compounded both of sin and frailty.

Who like an empty bird's-nest. This line is very uncertain. There are two main difficulties: 1) the force of לפני and 2) the meaning of עש. 1) לפני is supposed to mean "before" in the sense of "sooner than": They are crushed more quickly than the moth.[48] But this involves a rhetorically very poor exaggeration. Again it is translated "as the moth."[49] This interpretation is regularly based upon 3 24 and I S. 1 16. But this is to explain one doubtful reading by two others equally doubtful. Further, in both these translations the moth is taken as the symbol of what is easily destroyed, whereas it is used elsewhere in Scripture of a destroyer.[50] We would expect here some such word as כן, "gnat" (cf. Is. 51 6 and RV.mg.). Ehrlich, followed by Jastrow, has proposed to explain עש on the basis of the Arabic as an empty bird's-nest both here and at Job 27 18 and Ps. 39 11 (12). This would relieve one of the difficulties, but not the difficulty of לפני. I have, for want of a better solution, ventured to follow Ehrlich.[51]

4 20. *With no one to lay it to heart.* This follows the usual interpretation. It expresses a fine thought but involves the supposition of a probably unique verb form, מֵשִׂים. Suggested emendations carry no conviction.

4 21. *When their tent-pin is removed.* The Hebrew word, יתרם, is usually translated tent-cord. But the word is nowhere else used of a tent-cord but

---

[47] Gen. 2 7, 3 19; Ps. 103 14ff.

[48] AV. and RV. txt. both here and at 8 12, Du. (with emendations), Dr. preferably.

[49] So G. and RV. mg. and most scholars, e. g. Ew., Hitz., Di., Ehr., Jast., Bt., Bu., and Ball, K., but with grave doubts and various suggestions for emendation.

[50] Job 13 28; Is. 50 9, 51 8; Hos. 5 12; Ps. 39 11 (12), which verse should be read according to RV.mg., not RV.txt. Job 27 18 is text-critically doubtful. Hitzig's view which seems to follow V.'s *a tinea* (by the moth) and which takes the clause as equivalent to "they are crushed as by a moth," in order to retain the moth as a symbol of the destroyer, is impossible. The verb "to crush" cannot describe a moth's activity.

[51] The verb in this clause is active, "they crush them." This is possible but not probable. Best point passive, יְדֻכְּאוּ (Du., Bu.) omitting ם which is probably an accidental repetition of the ם in יסודם, in spite of the fact that the pronominal suffix is already recognized in G.

only of a bow-string.[52] The word for tent-cord is either מיתר[53] or חבל[54]. Again, the verb נסע is never used with "cord" or any of its synonyms. The verb to break or snap a cord, rope, thong, etc. is always נתק.[55] The usage is so unmistakable that נסע can be joined with יתר in the sense of tent-cord only with the greatest improbability.[56] Under these circumstances it is safest to emend, in accordance with the verb נסע to tent-pin, (יָתֵד), for which Is. 33 20, in its carefully distinguished use of נסע with the tent-pin and נתק with the tent-cord, is conclusive evidence. As against this usage the objection that בם agrees better with tent-cord than with tent-pin cannot weigh. It is easy to suppose that these two letters are due to dittography after יתרם, or to read מהם, "from them," with Syr. and V.[57] It must be noted, however, that whichever word is read the figure of a collapsed tent is unexpected at this point where the reference has been to the figure of clay houses—another instance of the rather unfortunate style of this section (?).[58]

The death of ignorant men. Lit.: "Shall they not die, but not in wisdom ?" The phrase, "not in wisdom," means "in ignorance" and is to be understood in the light of Job 36 12; Prov. 5 23; 10 21. This poor, frail life, lived in ignorance, inevitably ends in death. Ignorance and death are, so to speak, organically connected. But just as wisdom has a moral shade of meaning, so has ignorance. It involves sin. When it is said in Proverbs:

---

[52] Jd. 16 7—9, cf. Moore ad loc., and RV.mg.; Ps. 11 2; Job 30 11.

[53] Used six times of the cords of the tabernacle (e. g. Ex. 35 18), and at Is. 54 2; Jer. 10 20; once of a bow-string, at Ps. 21 12 (13).

[54] Is. 33 20.

[55] Used of a sandal thong, Is. 5 27, of a tent cord, מיתר or חבל, Jer. 10 20, Is. 33 20; of a bow-string, יתר, (the same word as at Job 4 21) Jd. 16 9; of a heavy rope, Jd. 16 12; of a thread, Jd. 16 9, Eccl. 4 12; and quite frequently with the more general word for bonds מוסרה, e. g. Jer. 5 5.

[56] This usage makes very strongly against Buttenwieser's otherwise rather attractive theory that the allusion here is not to a tent but to weaving, and the figure is of the woven life cut off from the thrum (cf. K., "life-cord"). Cf. Is. 38 12, where this figure is expressly found, and Job 6 9, 27 8, where there may well be an elliptical allusion to the same figure (cf., also, the Greek myth of the Parcae). But נסע is not found in any of these passages, but בצע as we would expect (cf. karada in the Arabic parallels which Buttenwieser adduces). Jd. 16 14 is no support for this interpretation (cf. Moore ad loc.).

[57] Cf. Be. For tent-cord, Ew., Mx., Di., Du., Bu., Dr., Jast.; for tent-pin, Olshausen, Hitz., Volz, Steuer. Ball does not decide. Ehrlich's interpretation is unconvincing. AV.'s "excellency" (cf. T.) and V.'s reliqui are certainly mistaken.

[58] G. has an entirely different reading: "He hath blown upon them and they have withered away," apparently a quotation from Is. 40 24, though the phraseology differs slightly in the Greek of the two passages. It can hardly be explained out of the present Hebrew text as Beer and Ball would have us believe.

> The lips of the righteous feed many,
> But the foolish die for lack of understanding (10 21).

it is clear that the fool who is contrasted with the righteous must be also a wicked fool. Frailty, ignorance, sin, death are inseparable. How different is the lot of those who follow wisdom!

> Length of days is in her right hand,
> In her left are riches and honor.
> Keep sound wisdom and discretion,
> So shall they be life unto thy soul.[59]

This contrasts with the pathetic ending to our present section. Yet in spite of the moving quality of vv. 18—21, it cannot be denied that the text is suspicious. The confusion of the two figures of the mud-brick house and the tent, the great doubt as to v. 19c, the stylistic awkwardness at v. 19a, raise doubts as to the originality of this elaboration of v. 17. The poetical structure of vv. 18—21 is also uncertain. At present there are nine lines arranged in a quatrain, vv. 18—19a, b; a tristich, vv. 19c—20; and a closing couplet, v. 21. The attempts which have been made to rearrange into an orderly structure[60] must be considered quite unconvincing. While the mood of the passage is appealing and reminds of the pathos in the story of the Fall, the phrasing of it remains unsatisfactory. Vv. 19—20 are best taken as a series of relative clauses, not coordinate clauses as is often done.

5 1. The meaning of this verse in its present connection is extremely doubtful. The general subject of 5 1—7 is the danger of impatience. Impatience killeth the fool. It is clear from Job's reply at 6 2 that he saw in this section a rebuke of his first speech (c. 3) and, indeed, this is the only way the section as a whole can be interpreted. It is in no sense an attempt to explain Job's sufferings, for these had already overtaken him *before* his outbreak in c. 3. No doubt it assumes the doctrine of retribution but it is

---

[59] Prov. 3 16, 21f. The commentators are rather indefinite as to the exact meaning of the expression, "not in wisdom." E. g. "without having attained unto wisdom" (Dr.); Ball compares the line from a Babylonian poem: "How have mortals learned the way of God?"; "in ignorance and therefore unprepared" (Di. after De.); "through lack of foresight" (Jast.); opposed to wisdom as "the unconditional submission to the will of God" (Du.); "in ignorance, causing their own death" (Hitz.), etc.

[60] E. g. Duhm's or Ball's quatrain arrangements. The older commentators (Ew., De., Di.) divide vv. 12—21 into two strophes: a) vv. 12—16, b) vv. 17—21, each of eleven lines. Merx divides into three strophes, 8 × 7 × 7!

not a theoretical formulation of that doctrine or application of it to Job's case. What we have in this section is a solemn warning of the danger in which he now stands because of his attitude toward his sufferings. It is the sin of his complaints because of his sufferings, not an explanation of his previous sufferings, that Eliphaz is here thinking of. Accordingly 5 1—7 returns in thought to 4 2—8. But there is an obviously increased emphasis in the latter section upon the danger of his attitude. In the introductory section there is only mild expostulation; here there is a very pronounced warning. But is there, then, no relationship to the section immediately preceding, 4 12—21? The transition from 4 12—21 to 5 1—7 is admittedly not quite clear. The obscurity may be due to the fact that 4 18—21 has become more or less corrupted, as we have seen.[61] But when the two sections are put into juxtaposition to each other, it suggests that the probably intended transitional thought is this: If man as man is so frail and sinful, how foolish it is for him to complain![62] But the question now arises: How is 5 1 related to its context?

At this point the commentators find themselves in difficulties. It is interesting to observe how Dillmann, in his paraphrase of the sequence of thought, in which he formulates Ewald's position more precisely, passes over 5 1 altogether: "5 1—7. The consequences which result for Job from the truth of the (preceding) revelation. If no man is just or pure before God, then impatience over suffering, which man has to bear, is not merely unjustifiable and useless, but foolish, sinful, and worthy of punishment." Driver has, almost word for word, the same paraphrases. But this gives no light on the contextual meaning of 5 1. On this verse Dillmann remarks, again reformulating Ewald's view: "Try to call for help against supposed injustice on one who, because of his position, could represent you before God—you will find that not one will hear your cry." This is a paraphrase of the verse but fails to illuminate its relationship to the context. Budde makes a sharp break in the speech between 4 12—21 and 5 1—7. He holds that the two sections have nothing to do with each other. The first deals with the universality of man's sinfulness, the second with the particular folly of the fool. 5 1, it is now claimed, is necessary in order to introduce the second thought. It is an expression of the impotent passion of the fool, the danger of which is elaborated in what follows. Driver gives a more precise statement of the same idea: "Let not Job appeal unto the angels, thereby manifesting the irritation of the foolish; but let him turn in the right temper unto God (v. 8)."[63] But it may be asked whether 5 1 is a natural expression of impatience. Further, it is very clear that in v. 2 Eliphaz is thinking of Job's complaints in c. 3. We would therefore expect v. 1 also to be an allusion to the same complaints, if v. 1 is an example of impatience. But there is nothing in c. 3 to suggest that Job was appealing to the angels or had ever done so. As a matter of fact, the thought of impatience is simply read into v. 1 from the context. The verse itself does not express such an idea. Hitzig long ago suggested that 5 1 is a parenthesis and that 5 2 follows on 4 21 (cf. Be.) and the meaning is: Men die in ignorance (there is none to answer when they call for help in the hour of death), for impatience slays the fool. This view, that the appeal to the Holy Ones is at the hour of death, is so strained that it has had no followers, but it is interesting as showing Hitzig's feeling that 5 1 is intrusive. Duhm, Siegfried and Schmidt hold that 5 1 is a gloss, either to 4 21 (Sieg.) or to 4 18 (Du.). Duhm's suggestion seems decidedly the best. The fact that the doctrine of the intercession of Angels is especially prominent in the later literature[64] may also cast some doubt on the verse, though not necessarily so.[65] Buttenwieser, in order to avoid this doubt, identifies the Holy Ones with the Welis or Saints, of which we find modern representatives in Syria and Palestine, but connects them with primitive Semitic beliefs rather than with belief in intercessory angels which Buttenwieser himself admits to be post-biblical. But the formula at 5 1 is too much like those in the passages just cited (note 64) for the connection between them to be successfully denied. Budde and Driver seek to defend the originality of 5 1 by 5 8 which is supposed to be in conscious antithesis to it. But v. 8 is much better taken as antithetic to vv. 2—5 (see below). Other commentators either have nothing to say on the contextual meaning or originality of 5 1 or add nothing of importance to the points of view already examined.[66]

---

[61] G.'s variant (see note 58 above) may also testify to the fact that the original literary transition has been lost through text-corruption.

[62] So Ew., Da., Di., Du., Dr., Ball; with more or less precision of statement.

[63] Cf. Da. and Peake for the same view, that 5 1 is an illustration of impatience. Budde, Driver and Peake also bring 5 8 and 5 1 into anti-

5 2. *Yea.* The exact significance of the Hebrew particle (כי) is doubtful because the connection of the verse is doubtful. Most commentators who maintain the originality of v. 1 take it in the sense of "nay" or "rather" after the implied negative in v. 1a.[67] Or it is connected immediately with 4 21 and given the sense of "for."[68] In view of the uncertainty of the ori-

---

thesis to each other. Driver, however, unlike Budde, brings 4 12—21 and 5 1—7 into immediate connection in the way suggested above.

[64] Cf. Tobit 12 12; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi 3 5; and especially Enoch, 9 3, 15 2, 39 5, 40 6, 47 2, 89 76; 99 3, 104 1. For Holy Ones as a title of Angels, cf. Job 15 15; Zech. 14 5; Dan. 4 13, 8 13; Ps. 89 5, 7 (6, 8), and frequently in Enoch, e. g. 1 9.

[65] Cf. Zech. 1 12 for a possible fore-gleam of this doctrine; also Job 33 23.

[66] Cf. Volz, Jast., Steuer., Bt., K. The construction by which Ehrlich seeks to defend the originality of the verse is strained in the extreme.

[67] Ew., Bd., Di., Ball, Dr., K.

[68] Hitz., Du., and so G., Th., EV. It is interesting to notice that Volz, Jast., and Bt. omit the word in their translations.

ginal connection the particle has been given in the translation its asseverative force (cf. V.'s vere).

Impatience. "Wrath" (AV.) follows G. and Th. (ὀργή). Better "vexation" (so RV. here and at Prov. 12 16, 27 3; "fretful" at Prov. 21 19).

Passion. The Hebrew word (קנאה) is taken here in this special sense, in which it is parallel to anger.[69] "Envy" of AV. and "jealousy" of RV.txt. (cf. G.'s ζῆλος and V.'s invidia) are misleading, for Eliphaz is referring at this point to the fierce outbreak of Job in c. 3 as is proved by Job's retort at 6 2. "Passion" is also a more suitable word in the mouth of Eliphaz as a characterization of Job's speech than "indignation" of RV.mg.

Without self-control. The word in this form (פֹּתֶה) is found again only at Prov. 20 19 where both meaning and text are doubtful (cf. Toy ad loc.) and Hos. 7 11 ("a silly dove"). The root has the idea of "open" or accessible, either to good influences, or more frequently to bad ones. In Arabic it often has the sense of youthfulness (cf. Sym.'s νήπιον and V.'s parvulum), probably with the suggestion of lack of foresight, heedlessness, rashness. Cf. especially the noun פתי at Prov. 22 3; 27 12 where it is set in antithesis to ערום in the sense of "shrewd," "prudent."[70] The allusion in 4 2 is to the rash and uncontrolled outburst of Job. The proper translation of this verse which should show its relation to c. 3 is of the greatest importance since it is made at the same time the starting-point of Job's reply in c. 6.

5 3. *Taking root.* Supported by the ancient Versions, and cf. Ps. 37 35f. There is here an intended allusion to the former prosperity of Job (see Interpretation). The proposed emendation to "uprooted"[71] misses the subtlety of this reference.

Accursed. The first person, "I cursed,"[72] of the present Hebrew text is almost certainly incorrect. That Eliphaz prophesied the fool's ruin, cursing him because he anticipated God's curse upon him, (Ew.) or that Eliphaz's curse recognized the curse of God that had already fallen upon the fool, a retrospective curse rather than an anticipative one,[73] or that the curse of Eliphaz himself accomplished the fool's ruin, which is the most natural interpretation of the Hebrew, are suggestions which introduce Eliphaz's activity into the picture in a most improbable way. Nor does any of them do justice to the "suddenly." But if the slight emendation to the third person passive (ויוקב) is adopted,[74] then the striking picture is obtained of the fool taking root but suddenly brought to ruin by the curse of God, a picture which greatly impressed Eliphaz but which would unfortunately remind Job of the visitations that had so swiftly fallen upon him. The various emendations of the verb "curse" in modern times,[75] following the unfortunate lead of G.'s ἐβρώθη ("gnawed" or "devoured"), are not only quite unnecessary but also overlook the allusion to the series of sudden calamities which overtook Job according to the Prologue. (See Interpretation.)

---

[69] Cf. Dt. 29 20 (19); Zeph. 1 18; Ps. 79 5, in all of which passages it is associated with various words for anger.

[70] The "silly one" of EV. is hardly suitable here.

[71] So Be., Du., Volz, Ball.

[72] So Aq., T., V., EV., followed by Ew., Hitz., De., Da., Di., K.

[73] Hitz., De., Di., Da.

[74] Dr., Bt.

Homestead. G.'s δίαιτα is peculiar to the author of Job in the Old Testament, and a favorite word. It is found thirteen times in Job and again only at Judith 12 15.

5 4. *The Court abandons them* etc. Lit. They are crushed in the gate. For "gate" in the sense of a court of justice, cf. Job 31 21; Prov. 31 23; Amos 5 10; Is. 29 21 and often. For the verb "crush", used of the "sore oppression" of a court of Justice, cf. Prov. 22 22. 5 4b shows that Eliphaz did not mean to hit at Job, for it does not agree with the Prologue. But Job's attention would be caught by v. a rather than by v. b.[76]

5 5. *What they harvest.* Read the verb, with G., instead of the noun. The remainder of the verse is hopelessly corrupt. For "snare" (RV.; AV. has "robber"!) of the last line we are probably to read "thirsty" with Aq., Sym., V. (G. seems to omit the word) and cf. G. at 18 9 where the same word is again read "thirst," though in this case certainly incorrectly. "Thirsty" would seem to be the parallel to "hungry" ("famished") in the first line, though "the hungry" is a singular and "the thirsty" is a plural. The probable parallelism suggests that the first and third line of the verse originally formed a couplet. This may in turn suggest that the unintelligible second line "and taketh it even out of the thorns" (EV.) is either not original or should be transposed as in the translation. In that case its companion line is probably lost. The translation indicates the impossible nature of the present text, but suggests that originally v. 5 was a quatrain, in keeping with the excellent quatrain in vv. 3 and 4, which describe the fate of the impatient fool and his children. Vv. 1 and 2 would form another quatrain. But we have seen that v. 1 is probably secondary. V. 2 must accordingly be considered either an initial couplet, of which the quatrains in vv. 3—4 and v. 5 are the elaboration, or that v. 1 has taken the place of a lost couplet which once formed with v. 2 a quatrain. The translation follows the second alternative.[77]

---

[75] Mx., Du., Be., Bu., Volz, Ball, Ehr., Bart.

[76] For the admission of flings at Job in 5 2—7 cf. Bu., at v. 3; Hitz. and Di. at v. 4; Ew. and Jast. at vv. 3—5 generally; Bt. at v. 7b. Most commentators unfortunately seem to ignore them.

[77] The quatrain arrangements of Duhm (vv. 2—3, 4—5, reducing v. 5 to two lines) and Ball (vv. 1—2, 3—4, 5—6!) seem to me theoretically less likely than the one suggested above. Volz arranges in a quatrain (vv. 1—2) and in a six line stanza (vv. 3—5, reducing v. 5 to two lines again). The older

5 6—7. For this quatrain, see Excursus at the end of Comments. The omission of these verses does not affect the argument in the Interpretation, if the Hebrew text is followed and the usual interpretation is given to it.

5 8. *But I for my part.* The very strong Hebrew adversative used here sets Eliphaz's suggestion that Job should turn to God in antithesis to Job's impatient complaints, v. 2, which, as Eliphaz had just shown by his picture of the fool's fate, are dangerous. It is quite clear at this point that Eliphaz really had Job's speech (c. 3) in mind at v. 2, even though he expressed himself in an abstract and theoretical way, and that Job did his friend no injustice when he saw in v. 2 an allusion to himself.[78] Eliphaz is therefore contrasting at v. 8 what Job *should* do with what he *had* done; Job should seek God's help instead of complaining against him as he had done in c. 3. The attempt to set v. 8 into antithesis to v. 1 and thereby to defend the originality of v. 1[79] is, accordingly, quite beside the mark. V. 1 is not accounted for by anything in c. 3; it is not an expression of impatience, and in its mode of expression, it refers to a future possibility rather than to the past fact of Job's complaints, whereas, as we have just seen, the proper contrast intended by the adversative of v. 8 is between what Job should do and what he already had done. These considerations still further confirm the view that v. 1 is an intrusion. It is also important to notice that v. 8 8 in no natural antithesis to vv. 6—7.[80]

Make my appeal. More literally, "address myself." This follows G., V., T., and cf. Hitzig. "Commit my cause" (EV.) or "lay my affair or concern before God" (so most commentators) suggest that Job had a case, a supposition which Eliphaz would be unlikely to concede. What Eliphaz wishes Job to do is not to defend himself but to turn to God for information, help, consolation. The Hebrew word (דברתי) here translated "appeal" is found only here in this form as a noun; elsewhere it is a part of a compound prepositional phrase. It is the equivalent of אמרה, "speech" or "utterance," not of "cause" or "affair."

5 9. This verse begins a kind of doxology characterizing the God to whom Job is privileged to adress himself.

5 10. *Showers.* Lit. "waters."

Pasture lands. "Fields" (EV.). The Hebrew word, חוצות, means "open places" and often refers to streets in a city as contrasted with the houses, or, more rarely, to the open country-side as contrasted with the walled towns. Compare Prov. 24 27 where the word is translated "without" (EV.) and is parallel to "field," and Ps. 144 13 where it is used of pasture-land.

---

commentators (Ew., De., Di.) take vv. 1—5 as a single strophe of eleven lines. Merx reconstructs two eight-line strophes, vv. 1—4, vv. 5—7.

[78] See below at 6 2.

[79] See above at v. 1.

[80] See Excursus.

All open to the sky. I have here availed myself of the beautiful paraphrase, "upon the (land) under the sky" with which the first translator of Job (G.) renders חוצות. It is a favorite synonym of his for "earth" (ארץ) and gives a distinctly poetic touch to his translation.[81]

5 11. *Lifting.* To take the Hebrew לשום as an infinitive of purpose is exegetically poor, whether it is connected in thought with v. 8 (Ehr.) or v. 9 (Du.) or v. 10 (Bu.). The construction is either gerundial (Mx., Studer in Di., Jast.) or is to be emended after G. and V. to the participle, in keeping with the other participles in vv. 9—13 (Dr.), but without the article, in agreement with the other participles in these verses.[82] The infinitive is probably due to the influence of the two ל that follow.[83]

5 12. *Nought that endureth.* The Hebrew word (תשיה) thus paraphrased is of disputed etymology and uncertain meaning. "Enterprise" of EV. is found only here. Outside of Is. 28 29 and Mi. 6 9 the word occurs only in Job and Proverbs and thus seems to be a technical term of the Wisdom Literature. The idea of "practical value" seems to be associated with the word. At Is. 28 29 it might be translated by "efficiency"—Jahweh hath magnified efficiency—did not this rendering unduly endorse the great contemporary slogan by which, in the opinion of the apostles of Industrialism, the world is to be saved.

5 13. *Cunning.* The Hebrew word (חכמים) is used here in its rather rare bad sense. Cf. II Sam. 13 3 ("subtle," RV.), Prov. 3 7; 26 5, 12, 16.

Surprised by sudden disaster. A paraphrase of the rather rare and difficult Hebrew word נמהרה meaning "precipitated," or "carried headlong" (EV.). G., ἐξέστησεν; Sym., ταραχθήσεται. This is the only verse formally cited from Job in the New Testament, cf. 1 Cor. 3 19.

5 14. See below at 5 16.

5 15. V. a is undoubtedly corrupt (cf. txt. and mg. of RV.). T., Syr., V. and twenty Hebrew mss. support RV.'s text with its implied deletion of the preposition, "out of" (so Be.). The thought would then be interpreted by such passages as Ps. 57 4 (5); 59 7 (8); 64 3 (4) and refer to injuries wrought by the tongue—slander, cursing, lying, etc. This would relieve the grammatical difficulty, but the parallelism with v. b would suggest that some word corresponding to "the poor" should be read. Emendations seek in

---

[81] Cf. 2 2; 9 6; 18 4, 19; 34 13; 38 18, 24, 33; 42 15. Outside of Job it is found once in Proverbs (8 26, for תבל, "world") and in Baruch 2 2, 5 3; II Macc. 2 18.

[82] The article should also be omitted at v. 10a. Cf. a similar sequence of participles at Ps. 104 2—4, where, however, the construction of the participle with and without the article varies in the present text.

[83] Cf. for a similar cause of corruption 4 19 above.

various ways to better the parallelism. Some scholars find the difficulty in the phrase "from the sword" and variously correct to "the desolated" (Ew.), "the trembling" (Volz), "the orphan" (Bu. and Dr. tentatively); others find it in the phrase "from the mouth" (מפיהם) and read either "the two-edged sword" (פיפיות) after Ps. 149 6 (Ehr.) or deliberately substitute "the afflicted" (עני) for "from their mouth" (Du., Ball, Jast., Bart. after Siegfried). The translation follows this last suggestion which best satisfies the parallelism, though it is admittedly a pure guess and can scarcely be defended on strictly text-critical grounds (V.'s egenum, "needy" in v. a is hardly a sufficient support). The present reading may possibly be due to the פיה in v. 16b. G. entirely ignores the word in v. 15, but little weight should be attached to this fact, as G. is at this point very free.

5 16. Cf. Ps. 107 42.

Vv. 8–16 forms the first section of the third and last part of Eliphaz's speech. The quatrain arrangement seems to be intended: Vv. 8–9, a general ascription of praise to God; vv. 10–11, the beneficent activities of God in nature and among men; vv. 12–13, the contrasting visitations of God upon the wicked, and finally, vv. 15–16, the return to the thought of God's saving kindness, by means of which the transition to the next section is effected. I suggest that v. 14 is a later addendum to the quatrain in vv. 12–13. This quatrain is complete in itself as the first and third and second and fourth lines correspond. Further, the thought of v. 14 is found again in the doubtful passage, 12 25a, and both thought and wording recur at Dt. 28 29. V. 14 is also outside the participial construction of the first lines in vv. 8–13 (see above).[84] Duhm and Volz secure a quatrain arrangement by retaining v. 14 and rejecting v. 10 on the ground that the reference to God's kindly activities in nature described in the earlier verse is outside the scope of the passage in which his activities in human society are emphasized. But Ps. 107 33f. shows the intimate connection of the two thoughts (Ball).[85]

---

[84] This is also true of vv. 15–16. But these verses draw the conclusion of all that has gone before, and the construction is intentionally changed in agreement with the thought. This is not the case at v. 14. K. significantly regards v. 14 as a parenthesis.

[85] Ball also adopts the quatrain system but wavers in the way he secures it. In his translation he brackets v. 12 but does not justify this in his notes. In the latter he suggests that v. 10 was a marginal quotation but does not bracket it in his translation. The older commentators adopt the longer strophical system. Ewald takes vv. 8–16 as one strophe of 18 lines (!). Dillmann divides into two strophes, vv. 8–11 (8 lines) and vv. 12–16 (10 lines). This recognizes a real thought division between vv. 11 and 12, which is also recognized by my quatrain division. Delitzsch divides as Dillmann does, but very inappropriately joins vv. 6–7 with 8–11. Merx very inappropriately takes v. 16 with v. 17 in order to secure his eight-line strophes, vv. 8–11 and vv. 12–15.

5 17. *Behold.* This exclamation in the Hebrew text (cf. EV.) is to be deleted (so G., Syr., V.), as it overfills the line. It was probably a note on the margin to call attention to the importance of the beautiful quatrain in vv. 17—18. Such comments are more numerous in the Old Testament than is often supposed and are psychologically very interesting as they reflect the impression which a given passage or verse made upon an ancient copyist or reader.[86] The quatrain in vv. 17—18, an exquisite example of the four line stanza, gives a classic formulation of the doctrine of suffering as chastisement.[87] It differs remarkably from 4 7—8 in which the doctrine of suffering as retribution for sin is announced, and from the oracle in 4 12—21 in which suffering and sin are attributed to man's creatureliness. It is interesting to notice, however, that Eliphaz does not recur again in the Dialogue to the thought of suffering as chastisement. It should also be noticed that from v. 17 to the end of the speech Eliphaz turns for the first time since the introductory verses (4 2—8) directly to Job.[88] There it was to expostulate with him; here to console him. This change in mood is of great importance for a true appraisal of the temper of the speech and of Eliphaz's attitude toward Job.[89]

5 18. Cf. for the thought and expression of this beautiful couplet, Hos. 6 1 and Dt. 32 39.

5 19. *In six.* G. "out of six." Though G. agrees well with the verb "deliver" and is followed by Beer and Duhm, the Hebrew text is probably to be retained on account of the parallelism.

5 19—26. The text and poetical arrangement of these verses are uncertain. When it is said, "in six misfortunes and in seven," the author makes use of a rhetorical figure often found in the Old Testament to express emphasis. At Ex. 20 5, for example, the phrase, "Jahweh will visit the iniquity of the Fathers upon the children, upon the third and the fourth generation," means that He will punish enough and more than enough. Similarly, in the present instance, "in six misfortunes and in seven" means in every conceivable danger. But is it the intention to name just seven examples of misfortune in what follows? In Prov. 6 16—19 (six or seven) and in Prov. 30 15—16, 18—19, 21—23, 29—31 (in all four instances "three or four") the numbers and the examples exactly correspond. At Sirach 25 7 ("nine or ten"),

---

[86] Cf. Is. 2 22 for another example, and Duhm ad loc.

[87] Cf. Ps. 94 12; Prov. 3 11—12.

[88] This fact also makes against the originality of 5 1.

[89] According to Ball "the opening, 'happy is the man' etc., is quite general, and the repeated 'thou's and thee's' of the following verses are no more personal to Eyob than those of Ps. 91." I believe this statement expresses a view of the speech quite the contrary of the author's real intention. See Interpretation.

26 5f. ("three or four"), 50 25f. ("two or three"), the examples and numbers are probably again intended to correspond. On the other hand, in Amos I ("three or four") there is no such correspondence.[90] In the many instances of numerical sayings in the Talmud and Midrash[91] only one number is regularly found. Wünsche explains this as due to the fact that the Rabbis in these sayings had dropped the principle of parallelism.[92] The close affinities of Job to Proverbs and Sirach would suggest that in 5 19—22 we should also look for seven examples of misfortune. In the present text there are seven distinct *references* to misfortune. But are there seven distinct *examples* of it? There would seem to be; but the series is certainly a singular one. Hunger and war (v. 20), tongue and ruin (v. 21), ruin and hunger and wild beasts (v. 23).[93] There are several difficulties in this enumeration. a) The tongue unexpectedly intrudes into what seems to be a series of natural calamities. b) The repetition of ruin and hunger in v. 22 as compared with hunger in v. 20 and ruin in v. 21. c) The very vague generalization in the word "ruin" ("destruction"). We would expect a reference to something more concrete. Of these difficulties the second is probably the most serious. To hold that v. 22a simply intensifies the hunger and ruin of the two preceding verses (Di.), i. e. "thou shalt *laugh* at them," is unconvincing. If v. 22a is to emphasize what precedes, why should war and tongue be omitted? To maintain that hunger and ruin in vv. 20 and 21 are different kinds of hunger and ruin from those in v. 22a, i. e. differently caused (Ehr.) has no warrant in usage or etymology. To reject the verse altogether[94] because of its repetitiousness is tempting but not advisable, for the repetitiousness is as pointless in a gloss as it is in the original text. If it is supposed that a reviser wished to secure the exact number seven, unintended by the original author, why did he repeat "ruin" but give a different and very rare word for "hunger" in v. 22a? It is probable that the author, himself, wished to give seven examples of plagues,[95] in which case

---

[90] Examples such as Is. 17 6; 2 K. 13 19; Mi. 5 5 (4); Eccl. 11 2, cited in König, *Stilistik*, p. 163, are, like Ex. 20 5, of a different character, as no illustrations of the numbers are involved.

[91] Wünsche in *ZDMG* for 1911, pp. 57ff., 421ff. and for 1912, 414ff.

[92] Cf. Job 13 20; Ps. 62 11 (12); Prov. 30 24.

[93] The word for ruin ("destruction," EV.) in vv. 21 and 22 is the same word though spelled differently (שוד, v. 21 and שד, v. 22). The word for "hunger" in v. 20 is a good Hebrew word (רעב); in v. 22 it is a so-called Aramaism (כפּן), found only here and at 30 3, though the verb of this root may be found at Ezek. 17 7 (the reading is doubtful). AV. translates both times by "famine," RV. varies the translation, "famine" in v. 20, "dearth" in v. 22.

[94] Be., Du., Volz; and, tentatively, Bu. Cf. also the double reference to wild beasts in v. 22b and 23b.

[95] So also Ehrlich and Ball. This is contrary to the views of most commentators.

v. 22 is necessary. The only thing left to do is to assume a deep-seated corruption at v. 22a which cannot now be satisfactorily cured.[96] G. evidently has difficulties with the text and has substituted for it: "At the unjust and lawless thou shalt laugh." That G. intended this as a translation of our present text, as Duhm intimates, is highly improbable. Nowhere else is the root שד (ruin) translated in G. by ἀδικεῖν, the word used here, or by any of its derivatives (cf. also, Ball). A further evidence that v. 22b, and therefore its parallel line, v. 22a, cannot be dispensed with is found in the conventional scheme of plagues which underlies vv. 19—22. The closest analogies to the passage are found in Ezek. 5 17 and, more elaborately worked out, 14 13—21. In these passages four major plagues are mentioned: hunger, evil beasts, sword, pestilence.[97] In Job, hunger, the sword, and wild beasts are mentioned, but not pestilence. The reference to wild beasts in v. 22b, in view of the conventional scheme of these plagues, would seem to be original. But if v. 22b is original, this would seem to require a parallel line now represented by the corrupted v. 22a. But if the author of Job is influenced by a conventional scheme of plagues, would we not also expect a direct reference to pestilence which is so prominent in the other illustrations? It is at this point that commentators have found difficulty at v. 21a. Why is the scourge or whip or lash of the tongue introduced into the midst of all these natural calamities? This has seemed so strange that scholars have sought to relieve the difficulty in various ways. Ehrlich, followed by Jastrow proposes to take the tongue as equivalent to a tongue of fire (!). Duhm would substitute רשף, Ball קטב, Driver, very tentatively, דבר—all three words synonyms for pestilence (cf. Bart., also).[98] But it is difficult to see how the present text could have arisen if the original text had referred to the scourge of pestilence, and since the proposed emendations are pure guesses it seems safer to retain the present reading. Yet its strangeness in this connection cannot be denied. Did the author have an ulterior purpose in substituting the scourge of the tongue for the scourge of pestilence?[99] Could this have been intended by him as a gentle irony directed against Eliphaz? For Eliphaz to promise Job protection against slander, to which the scourge of the tongue would seem to allude, when from Job's point of view the Friends themselves were slandering him, may easily be construed as a covert criticism of Eliphaz by the author. Is there a hint at this point of the way in which the author wishes to have the more attentive reader understand the whole passage vv. 19—22? (See Interpretation.) Possibly, also, the vagueness of the word, "ruin," in v. 21b, which, as we have seen, gives difficulty, may be another hint in the same direction. It is no more vague and indefinite than is the application of vv. 19—22 as a whole to Job. The fact is, the author is working here with a conventional series of misfortunes which are quite irrelevant to the situation with the one exception of the scourge of the tongue, and this last becomes relevant only in a most unexpected way, namely, when it is interpreted as a sly fling at Eliphaz by the author himself. (See Interpretation.)

---

[96] Ball's attempt to emend to "at the lion and young lion thou shalt laugh" is unconvincing.

[97] They are enumerated three times in the two passages, but each time in a different order. Cf. also Lev. 26 16—26 and Dt. 32 24f., where the phrasing varies but these four plagues are clearly meant.

[98] If it is urged that the Hebrew word שוט ("whip" or "scourge") is not used of the tongue elsewhere in the O. T., it may be replied that neither is it used of pestilence. But almost the exact Hebrew phrase, "scourge of the slanderous tongue," is found in the Hebrew of Sirach 51 2 and no doubt underlies the Greek of 26 6, which would seem to vouch for the present reading in Job; and for the thought cf. Ps. 31 20 (21) and possibly Jer. 18 18, though the interpretation of this last passage is not quite certain (cf. Du. and Volz ad loc.).

5 23. V. a, omitted in G^B., probably by accident, is found in G^A.. The thought of the clause is of a field without stones. To any one familiar with the character of Palestine the meaning implied in this line would be at once understood and very appealing.[100] It is admittedly somewhat curiously expressed, but its originality is guaranteed by the parallelism.[101] V. b, cf. Hos. 2 18 (20); Ezek. 34 25; Is. 11 6—8. The repetition of "field" (so the Hebrew text, cf. RV.) in both clauses of v. 23 is not in accordance with good Hebrew usage and in the present case especially unlikely, for "beasts of the field" (RV.) is equivalent to "wild beasts" just as "herb of the earth" is best translated "wild flowers."[102] But "stones of the field" can scarcely be translated "wild stones" (!). Probably Duhm is right in proposing "stones of the soil" (אדמה).[103]

---

[99] The translation, "from the lash" at v. 21a implies a slight emendation of the Hebrew (ב to מן) which is supported by G., Syr., V. and is adopted by most modern scholars. RV. so translates without acquainting the reader that it implies an emendation. Others read the form בשוט as an infinitive with varying significations (Bu., Ehr., Ball, K.).

[100] Cf. Is. 5 2; II K. 3 19, 25.

[101] Ball proposes to read "sons of the field" (בני for אבני) i. e. beasts, in synonymous parallelism with v. b. Rashi's emendation to "lords of the field" (אדוני for אבני) i. e. earth-demons, connected with the satyrs (שעירים cf. Lev. 17 5—7) has been revived by K. Kohler and followed by Beer (*ZATW* 1915, p. 63) and Buttenwieser, and is much more interesting. The rejection of the clause by Jastrow, following G ., is uncalled for.

[102] To be corrected to "herb of the field"; cf. Comment at v. 25.

[103] Cf. the "stony ground," πετρῶδες of Mark. 4 5, though the Greek word in Mark does not occur in G.

5 24. *Have the assurance.* Lit. "know." Cf. Dt. 9 3, 6, for this shade of meaning.

Inspect. Cf. Jer. 23 2, where the word ("visit," RV.) is used in both its good and bad senses. For the thought cf. Prov. 3 9f.

5 25. *Wild flowers.* Lit. "Grass or herb of the earth." To be corrected to "herb of the field," following G., T., and eight Heb. mss., as this is the standing phrase in the Old Testament. In Ex. 10 12b, 15a and in Ps. 105 35 which depends upon Exodus, RV. correctly translates "herb of the land," for the reference is to the Land of Egypt (Contrast "herb of the field" at Ex. 9 22, 25 and especially at 10 15b). Similarly, at Amos 7 2, "the grass of the land" (RV.) probably refers to the land of Israel. The only remaining place where the phrase occurs, Ps. 72 16, RV. translates it as in Job by "grass of the earth." But this passage is almost certainly dependent upon Job 5 25. It seems clear that ארץ (land or earth) is incorrect in Ps. 72 and Job 5 and "field" should be read.

To reject v. 25 as Jastrow does is again to ignore the purpose of the author. He wishes to portray Eliphaz as totally oblivious to the realities of the situation in which Job finds himself and thus he puts into the mouth of Eliphaz this most important blessing of descendants along with the other conventional promises with which he seeks to comfort Job, all the while remaining apparently quite unmindful of the fact that Job's children are all dead.[104] The author is here again indulging in irony at the expense of Eliphaz[105], just as he did when he put the reference to the scourge of the tongue into the mouth of Eliphaz in place of the usual pestilence.[106]

5 26. *Ripe old age.* EV., "full age." The Hebrew word (כלח) occurs again only at Job 30 2. Its meaning is obscure. G. omits and no help can be gathered from the other versions, either here or at 30 2.[107] The emendation to לח, "natural force," "vigor," which is found again at Dt. 34 7 is quite possible.[108]

Sheaf of wheat. The word is found again only at Ex. 22 6 (5); Jd. 15 5;

---

[104] The Epilogue, 42 13, in seeing to it that Job begets seven sons and three daughters after his restoration in the place of those he had lost, adopts the view of Eliphaz!

[105] So, expressly Du. and Bu. Cf., also Peake.

[106] Ball's view that Eliphaz throughout vv. 18—26 has Job's ruined estate "always present to his mind" and "with an appalling lack of sympathy," draws an idyllic picture of what might have been, I believe to be quite beside the mark. The mistake lies in the phrase, "always present to his mind." In his beautiful but rather abstract contemplation of the goodness of God Eliphaz ignores the hopelessness of Job's condition. See above and Interpretation.

[107] Cf. the discussion in Dr.

[108] Mx., Ball.

Job 21 32 (?). In Ex. and Jd. it is parallel to קמה "standing grain" or "sheaves."

To the threshing floor. This phrase interprets the Hebrew word כעלות "goeth up," wrongly translated in EV. by "cometh in." The English version suggests the idea of coming in to the barn. The author of Job is thinking of "going up" to the threshingfloor which is usually situated on some hillside where it is exposed to the wind which blows the chaff away. The present phrasing is an excellent example of the difficulties of translating an ancient poetic composition into modern speech. The atmosphere of a word, its natural associations and suggestions, which give to it its poetic significance and which would be felt at once by an ancient reader are often quite lost upon a modern reader. G. has a double translation of v. 26. In one the Hebrew word is translated by *θεριζόμενος*, "mowed" or "harvested;" in the other by *συγκομισθεῖσα*, "gathered in." In neither is the peculiar nuance of כעלות reflected.

The very beautiful close in vv. 23—26 certainly indicates the sincerity of Eliphaz. Granted that the promises in these verses are the conventional anticipations of the pious Israelite which correspond to the conventional anticipations of the pious Christian, except that the former are to be fulfilled in this life while the latter are to be realized in the next one, yet there is nothing in this conventionality that necessarily qualifies the sincerity of the promises. They were honestly meant even if they were irrelevant. But it must be admitted that even here the note of sympathy is lacking.[109]

5 27. *It agrees with what we have heard.* Lit. "We have heard it." Read first plural with G., Syr. and the majority of recent scholars instead of the imperative of the text (cf. EV.).[110] This slight emendation is made almost necessary by the emphasis given to the following "thou" in the Hebrew which indicates that Eliphaz is exhorting Job to accept what he himself and his friends believe. Their belief is not only the result of their own experience and careful investigation, but it agrees with what they have heard from tradition. This last thought is introduced here at the close of the speech to be elaborated later on in the debate (8 8—10).

Lay it to heart. Lit. "know it for thyself." Let it become thy deepest conviction.

On the poetic structure of vv. 17—27. There are three things to guide us. 1) Vv. 17—18 forms an admirable quatrain. 2) V. 27 does not form a natural quatrain with v. 26, but is to be taken as a concluding couplet corresponding to the introductory couplet at 4 2.[111] 3) The intervening verses,

---

[109] For the more or less conventional and irrevelant character of the consolations in 5 17—26 and the absence of any direct expression of sympathy, cf. Du., Bu., Peake, at v. 25; also De., Di., Da., Volz, Ball, generally; Jastrow and König do not appear to discuss these peculiarities.

[110] E. g. Du., Bu., Peake, Bart., Dr., Ball, Bt.

[111] So also Ew., Di., De., Volz, Steuer, K., and apparently Dr.

vv. 19—26, fall into two subsections so far as the thought is concerned. a) Vv. 19—22, the deliverance from the seven plagues, and b) vv. 23—26, the positive promises of future happiness. These two subsections are each composed of eight lines. There is no strictly logical or exegetical reason for dividing the first of these into quatrains. But in view of the fact that the quatrain arrangement seems to dominate the speech it does not seem to be unduly forcing matters to suppose that it obtains here also. Accordingly we secure the two stanzas, vv. 19—20 and vv. 21—22. The second group of eight lines can very easily be divided into two quatrains,[112] vv. 23—24, the promise of the fertility of Job's fields and the security of his estate, and vv. 25—26, the promise of numerous descendants and a long life. It is true that vv. 24—25 could also form a quatrain, as the first two lines in each verse begin in exactly the same way. But this disarranges both what precedes and what follows as it would bring vv. 26—27 together into one quatrain, which would be a very disparate and unlikely one, and would leave v. 23 stand as a lonesome couplet, provided it is separated from what precedes for the reason suggested above. It must be admitted, however, that the quatrain arrangement in vv. 19—26 is not as evident as elsewhere in the speech and it is possible that an eight-line division is intended here.[113]

Excursus on 5 6—7. Though with some hesitation, I have finally decided to omit this celebrated quatrain. Its meaning in itself and in its context is not at all clear.

A. To begin with v. 7_a. When it is said that man is born to trouble, which is in accordance with the present text of the Hebrew and of all the ancient versions, this is not an explanation of trouble, but the statement of *the fact* of trouble. It is not the intention to say that man is born to trouble in the sense that he is fated or foreordained to it by some power outside himself, for example, God. Rather, it means simply that trouble is the lot of mankind. The reason why this is so is not given. In the next place, v. 7a seems to be set in antithesis to the statements in v. 6 that "affliction" and "trouble" (EV.) do not spring out of the ground. By affliction and trouble is not meant subjective suffering, nor the suffering which one man occasions another as in 4 8, certainly not moral evil as König seems to hold, but the ills of life generally. But in precisely what does the antithesis between these statements and v. 7a consist? This is where the trouble begins. 1) Some commentators hold that it is between the external and the internal. "Sorrow and trouble," says Dillmann, "do not grow out of the earth like weeds, are not something external to man *** Rather, man is born to trouble; it is something innate in his nature. More especially it lies in his nature through sin to bring forth misery." (Cf. also Ew., Dr., with slight variations.) 2) Others find the contrast between the accidental and the necessary or inevitable, or else between the spontaneous and deliberate. According to Delitzsch, "Misfortune does not grow out of the ground like weeds; it is rather established in the divine order of nature."[114] It is noticeable that all commentators thus far reviewed feel compelled to introduce the thought of *weeds* at v. 6 in order to make its vague generalization more precise and thus secure some sort of antithesis to v. 7a. For the same reason they all assume that trouble is due to man's sin. That is, they have read into the simple statement of a fact at v. 7a an explanation of it. The simple statement that trouble, external trouble, is the lot of mankind (v. 7a) furnishes no antithesis to v. 6. To secure this the sinfulness of man must be assumed. In view of what was said above at 4 8 on *'awen* and *'amal*, it might be thought this assumption is a natural one. But the difficulty is that in the present case, where a sharp antithesis is supposed to exist between vv. 6 and 7a, it ought to be expressed. 3) The feeling that the active agency of man as a sinner ought to be stated here has suggested to still another group of scholars that the verb "is born" should be emended to the active "begets" which can be done without the change of a consonant:[115] Affliction does not spring from the ground; man is directly responsible for (begets) his own undoing. This sounds like an antithesis, though even so v. 6 leaves something to be desired in the way of clarity.

---

[112] For the two plagues in one line at v. 22a cf. Prov. 6 17a, 30 31 and Sirach 26 5 and 50 26.

[113] Duhm rejects the admittedly difficult v. 22 and arranges his quatrains as follows: vv. 21—23, 24—25, 26—27. This destroys the probably intended scheme of seven plagues through the omission of v. 22 and results in the unfortunate union of vv. 26 and 27. Ball retains v. 22, thereby preserving the scheme of seven plagues, but brackets v. 23 in order to secure a quatrain arrangement. But he gives no reason for his suspicion of v. 23. Volz divides into vv. 17—23, or twelve lines when v. 22 is omitted, and vv. 24—26, six lines, with v. 27 as a closing couplet. But to take v. 23 with what precedes rather than with what follows does not seem to be advisable. The older commentators play with very long strophes. Thus Ewald takes v. 17 and v. 27 by themselves and divides vv. 18—26 into two strophes of eighteen lines each corresponding to his eighteen-line strophe at vv. 8—16. Delitzsch and Dillmann, also separating v. 27, divide vv. 17—26 into two strophes of ten lines each, vv. 17—21 and 22—26. This arrangement also ignores the scheme of seven plagues. This scheme demands that vv. 19—22 should be separated from vv. 23—26. Merx's division into eight-line strophes, beginning with v. 16 (!): vv. 16—19, 20—23, 24—27 has nothing whatever to recommend it.

---

[114] So, with more or less confusion of statement, Hitz., Da., Ball. Ball also adds the contrast between "from below" i. e. "out of the ground" and "from above" which is left undefined. Peake, after Schlottmann, curiously suggests that the implied antithesis "from above" refers to the angels!

[115] So Be., Bu., Du., Steuer., Bt., K., following a suggestion of Böttcher.

Unfortunately the unanimous testimony of the versions supports the passive (is born).

B. Can v. 7b throw any light upon the passage? Unfortunately, it only adds still further uncertainties to the interpretation. The translation of the Hebrew phrase bene resheph ("sons of flame") by "sparks," though it goes back to a variant translation in the Targum and to the Jewish commentators, Kimchi and Rashi, and has been the current translation in modern times, is quite improbable. The word "sons" does not make the difficulty, but the word resheph. "Sons of fire" (*bene 'esh*) might easily be interpreted as the poetic equivalent of sparks (cf. "son of the bow," for arrow at 41 28 (20)). But resheph is not an exact equivalent, not even a poetical equivalent, for fire. Resheph means "flame" but not an ordinary flame. There is always the suggestion of fierceness or danger in the word.[116] It is also worthy of remark that none of the ancient versions recognizes this current translation of the phrase. They one and all see in v. 7b a reference to the flight of birds.[117] Siegfried and Ball propose, on the basis of G., to emend bene resheph to bene nesher ("the vulture's brood"), in itself a simple emendation and in better accord with the verb which literally means "fly high,"[118] and compare Job 39 27 for the exact phrase. The difficulty with this reading of the versions and the proposed emendation is that the same versions also find an allusion to birds at Dt. 32 24, and so also Sym., at Ps. 76 3 (4) and Aq. and Sym. at Ps. 78 48. But in none of these cases is the allusion contextual. The clear mistake of the versions in these other instances casts doubt on their reference to birds at Job 5 7 and on the proposed emendation which is based on it. In desperation Buttenwieser, following a suggestion of Böttcher, holds that bene resheph refers to passionate men, "hot-spurs," "high-flyers" (with a dig at Job). This would agree in a measure with v. 7a, if the verb were read as an active (begets), but we would expect in this quatrain which seems to be dealing with the ills of mankind a reference to such sons of Daedalus as crashing down to destruction rather than flying high.

---

[116] Cf. Ps. 78 48; Dt. 32 24; Hab. 3 5; Ps. 76 3 (4); Songs 8 6. The usage in these passages, the only places where the word occurs in the O. T. outside of Job 5 7, certainly does not suggest that "sons of the flame" means sparks. The combination of lightning, pestilence and arrows in these passages just cited may seem odd at first sight, but the term, resheph has mythological associations which help to explain it. There was a Syrian, more particularly Phoenician god, Resheph. He was a fire god, especially a god of the lightning. At the same time he seems to have been a god of pestilence, for the Greeks identified him with their own Apollo, the "far-darter" who was armed with the bow and sent pestilences as his arrows. One of his titles was Resheph of the Arrow, not "of the streets" (Apollo Aiguis) as Cleremont Ganneau earlier suggested (cf. Paton, *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, III, p. 181a, and IX, p. 890b; also Dr. at Dt. 32 24). These associations of the term also make strongly against the translation, "sparks." Is T.'s son of the daemons a reminiscence of this mythological significance of Resheph?

[117] G., "The vulture's brood" (cf. Aq. and Sym.); V., "Man is born to sorrow and the bird to fly."

[118] This verb fits neither lightning nor sparks. To weaken it to "fly upward" (EV.), in order to fit it to "sparks," is a dubious expedient.

It is clear that we have in vv. 6 and 7 a quatrain of almost insoluble difficulty. The only line in it that seems at all clear is v. 7a and this can be taken in two ways, according as the verb is read as a passive referring to the general lot of mankind, or as an active describing man's direct responsibility for his lot. As the rest of the quatrain seems intended in some way or other to reinforce v. 7a, we have next to ask whether either of the ideas it can express is in harmony with its context.

C. On the contextual relationship of v. 7a.

1) If the verb is read as a passive, "man is born to trouble," then v. 7a goes back directly to the thought in 4 12—21 and is a resumption of that thought. The assumption which, as we have seen, scholars regularly make at v. 7a that suffering is the general lot of mankind because sin is innate in man, can now be justified, for this is the explicit teaching of 4 12—21. This is a distinct advantage to the interpretation of v. 7a. But there is a corresponding disadvantage. If 5 6—7 is a resumption of 4 12—21, then 5 2—5 becomes a digression, as Dillmann long ago pointed out. But that the author intended it to be a digression is altogether improbable. In the first place this section forms the starting-point for Job's reply in his next speech. It is therefore a very important element in the author's conception of this first speech of Eliphaz and we would not expect it to be relegated to a digression. Further, 5 2—5 is not only a link between this speech and the next, but also a link between 4 12—21 and 5 8ff. In view of the fact that Job as a man is sinful, 4 12—21, it does not become him to be impatient, 5 2—5, but he should follow the advice of Eliphaz and turn humbly unto God, 5 8ff. It is clear that 5 2—5 is in no sense a digression but a very organic part of the speech and in its logical position. Other scholars, perhaps half-conscious of this fact, seek to connect 5 6—7 not only with 4 12—21 but also with 5 2—5. According to Driver, "Eliphaz justifies his position that it is foolish to complain of misfortune by the thought that misfortune, because of sin, is the lot of mankind." But this position has already been justified when 5 2—5 is placed after 4 12—21 (see above). Further, we have already seen that 5 2—5 is intended to point out the danger of impatience. But while the statement that it is *unreasonable* to complain since all men are born to trouble is a clear thought, to say that it is *dangerous* to complain because all men are born to trouble is not a clear thought. Davidson attempts to coordinate the two passages, 4 12—21 and 5 2—7, under the rubric: causes of affliction. "The general evil and imperfection of man, 4 12—21, and the particular rebelliousness of the fool, 5 2—5, show how affliction arises, and

Eliphaz confirms the whole by his general maxim, 5 6—7." Again, it must be insisted upon that 5 2—5 is not intended to explain suffering but to emphasize the danger of giving way to passion. Equally irrelevant is Ball's suggestion: "The ruin of the fool is not due to ill luck or mischance; for affliction is not spontaneous or accidental (v. 6) but an inevitable consequence of the congenital imperfection of man." Quite the contrary, 5 2—5 says very distinctly the opposite, namely, that the ruin of the fool is due to his own folly in yielding to impatience. Nothing reveals the tantalizing ambiguity of 5 6—7 better than these various attempts to relate this quatrain to its context. Can we obtain a more satisfactory connection if the verb in v. 7a is read as an active—"man begets trouble?"

2) Scholars who adopt this emendation do not discuss the connection of the passage with what precedes in any very precise way, but Budde very significantly brings v. 7a into parallelism, not with 4 12—21, but with 4 8.[119] Undoubtedly the thought that mankind begets trouble or sows what he reaps follows on 5 2—5 more easily than the thought that man (because of sinfulness) is born to trouble. But the objection to this reading of the active verb in 5 7b, apart from the unanimous testimony against it in the ancient versions, is the present position of the verse. If it is the equivalent of 4 8 its position after 4 12—21 is very unfortunate.

At 4 12—21 it was, as we have seen, the purpose of Eliphaz to implicate Job in sin in the least offensive way. No particular sins, no direct responsibility of Job for his sufferings are alleged. He is implicated only in the general sin of mankind. To insist upon the direct responsibility of man for his sufferings, as would be done if the verb in 5 7a is read as an active, would largely defeat the kindly purpose which Eliphaz had in mind in his very general formulation at 4 12—21. Thus, if the verb in 5 7a is read as a passive, the line will agree with 4 12—21, but it will be hard to relate it to 5 2—5. If the verb is treated as an active, in harmony with 4 8, it will agree better with 5 2—5, but 5 7a will then largely undo what Eliphaz meant to accomplish by 4 12—21, besides being opposed to all the early textual evidence. Thus, no satisfactory explanation of the quatrain in 5 6—7, either in itself or in its relation to the context, is to be found, and it must be regarded as an intrusion. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, when the offending quatrain is removed, 5 8ff. is seen to attach in the most natural way to 5 2—5.[120]

[119] So also Hitzig expressly (though retaining the verb in the passive, thereby confusing his exegesis) and Steuernagel impliedly.

[120] Wellhausen seems to have been the first to recognize the secondary character of 5 6—7 (*Jahrbücher f. Deutsche Theologie*, Vol. 16, p. 557). His reason is that the quatrain is alien to its context though he does not state in what respect it is alien. He has been followed by Siegfried, Beer, Duhm, Volz and Jastrow. Duhm argues the question at greatest length, but the alleged rhetorical inconsistencies between 5 6—7 and 4 18—21 carry little

conviction. Barton admits the "vagueness and uncertainty" of the verses. Peake points out some of their difficulties but still holds to their genineness. Ehrlich's attempt to relieve their obscurities is unconvincing. König not only reads the verb in v. 7a as active (begets) but also holds that v. 6 refers not to physical suffering but to moral evil, and paraphrases: "The evil activity of man and its unfortunate consequences do not flow out of a physical source" to which admittedly platitudinous affirmation v. 7 forms the antithesis. As a corrective gloss to 4 12—21, which seeks to warn against the idea there expressed that physical frailty and sin are organically connected, v. 6a, thus explained, might have some meaning, but in its present position it would be pointless. In any case, the interpretation of v. 6a as referring to moral evil is more than doubtful.

THE DISLOCATIONS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER OF JOHN

W. RANDOLPH CHURCH
AMHERST COLLEGE

EVERYONE who has read attentively the Gospel according to John must have been struck by the confusion in the story of the trial of Jesus before the Jewish authorities (18 12—27). Jesus was led "to Annas first; for he was father in law to Caiaphas, who was high priest that year." Peter and another disciple who was known to the high priest followed Jesus (15—18), and here Peter made one of his denials. Jesus was questioned (19—23), by Annas we should have supposed, but we read that it was by the high priest, and we have just been informed that the "high priest that year" was Caiaphas, the phrase being a repetition of the phrase used of Caiaphas in 11 49, the only other place in this Gospel (outside the limits of this episode) where the high priest is mentioned.[1] "Annas therefore sent (ἀπέστειλεν οὖν) him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest" (24). The King James Version renders this "Now Annas had sent," which relieves the difficulty and which Robertson[2] seems to think justifiable, although the case is made more uncertain by the fact that the *Sinaiticus* and other MSS. have δὲ in place of οὖν, and still others have neither. The narrative of Peter's denials is continued in vv. 25—27. But it now seems, if we have "sent" and not "had sent" in v. 24, that he is standing in the same group around the same fire, all before the door of Caiaphas' house[3], whereas in the first part of this narrative the scene was taking place before the door of the house of Annas, for, in spite of the ambiguity of the phrase "high priest," v. 15 would incline to indicating that Jesus was led into the court of Annas. Some[4] have supposed that these two houses opened out into the same courtyard, which would make it possible for Peter to be "standing and warming himself" before whichever door the author wished to indicate. But, even if we acquiesce in this rather unsatisfactory explanation, no amount of interpretation will determine the identity of the high priest who did the questioning.

---

[1] To evade the difficulty as Bernard does (J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, Edinburgh, 1928, vol. i, p. xxviii) by arguing that, since ex high priests were sometimes referred to as high priests, the reference in verse 15 may quite well be to Annas, is to accuse the author of writing carelessly.

[2] A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*^{4}, New York, 1923, p. 841. Cf. *contra* Friedrich Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, London, 1898, p. 58; Bernard, *op. cit.*, on 18 24.

To remedy the confusion, and to make the narrative agree with that of Matthew (26 57—75) and Mark (14 53—72), a number of scholars have suggested changes in the order. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, in his commentary on John,[5] introduces after ἐκείνου in v. 13 the words ἀπέστειλεν δὲ αὐτὸν δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα from v. 24, and makes it clear that he intends these words to be read in the text of both passages; unfortunately we can not tell whether Cyril merely placed these words here on conjecture or whether he was guided by some source of information which we do not now possess. Similarly in the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* the words ἦν γὰρ πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα are omitted, and in the margin stand the words *et Annas misit Iesum*

---

[3] Bernard's suggestion (*op. cit.*, on 18 25) that verse 25a, "And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself", is intended to bring the reader back from the house of Caiaphas, where Jesus now was, to the house of Annas, seems to me again to amount to a charge of careless writing.

[4] Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, vol. i, Boston, 1886, p. 888; Marcus Dods, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. i, New York, 1897, p. 848.

[5] Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 74, Paris, 1859, col. 593D. This variation of Cyril's and also the variations which follow may be found in Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. i, Lipsiae, 1869, pp. 929ff.

ad Caiapham, which Miniscalchi transferred to the end of the verse (after τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου); in this also v. 24 is found in its customary place. The Philoxenian Syriac has in the margin after ἐκείνου the words *Misit eum igitur Annas vinctum ad Caiapham*, which Barsalibi put into the text. The Vienna MS. *Suppl. Gr.* 102 of the year 1192 (Tischendorf's *min.* 225) adds after πρῶτον in v. 13 ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα. Although these versions vary slightly among themselves, and although the omission of ἦν γὰρ πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα by the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* makes ὃς ἦν ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου refer to Annas, each of these orders is clearly intended to indicate that it was Caiaphas, and not Annas, who questioned Jesus; but none improves the continuity of the story of Peter's denials. Theodore of Mopsuestia[6] united the story of the denials into one unbroken narrative by transposing vv. 25—27 so that they followed v. 18, but this does not remove the uncertainty as to the identity of the high priest. If we suppose that the trial was before Annas, as this sequence would also seem to place it, we are not helped in understanding why Caiaphas is mentioned, for he is then introduced as an incidental figure from whose presence Jesus is immediately led on to the Praetorium. It might be said that all of the troubles would be eliminated if the change made by Theodore were combined with one such as that made by Cyril. But aside from reasons which will be given later which lead me to believe that the resulting order was not that of the original, there is also the disadvantage that with this combination the sending of Jesus to Caiaphas would be followed not by the trial, as in Matthew and Mark, but by Peter's three denials. Martin Luther, in his German Bible of 1545,[7] inserted a note to v. 14: "Here should stand the verse 'And Hannas sent him bound unto the high priest Caiaphas' . . . misplaced by a scribe in turning a leaf, as often happens." This change is open to the same objection as those which involve only a transposition of v. 24.

---

[6] Alfred Loisy, *Le Quatrième Evangile,*^{2} Paris, 1921, p. 457.

[7] *Werke: Die Deutsche Bibel,* 4. Band, Weimar, 1923, p. 303.

Spitta's order[8] 12, 13, 19—24, 14—18, 25b—27, and Moffatt's order[9] 12—14, 19—24, 15—18, 25b—27, have the advantage of running the narrative of the denials together into a unity, but they do not relieve the uncertainty as to who questioned Jesus. To relieve this uncertainty it is necessary, as Alfred E. Garvie has pointed out[10], that v. 24 should precede v. 19.

The Syriac Palimpsest of the Gospels discovered by Mrs. Lewis[11] in 1892 at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai displays an order far superior to all those mentioned above. The date of this MS., according to Dr. Burkitt, is not later than the beginning of the fifth century.[12] As to the text which it represents there is considerable doubt. Dr. Burkitt believes that this MS. reproduces the text as it was at Antioch at the end of the second century.[13] On the other hand Mrs. Lewis herself believes that the translation was made before the time of Tatian (160);[14] for this view there is the support of Hjelt,[15] Merx,[15] Blass[15] and Bewer.[16] The sequence of verses found in the palimpsest is as follows: 12, 13, 24, 14, 15, 19—23, 16—18, 25b—27. This sequence clears up admirably the discrepancies in the traditional order, and Blass has gone so far as to say, "This is the narrative of the real author; the other one is that of blundering scribes."[17]

---

[8] Friedrich Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, vol. i, 1893, pp. 168ff.

[9] James Moffatt, *The Historical New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 528f.

[10] "Notes on the Fourth Gospel," *The Expositor*, Eighth Series, VIII (1914), pp. 372f.

[11] Agnes Smith Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, London, 1910, ad loc.; *Some Pages of the Four Gospels Re-transcribed from the Sinai Palimpsest*, London, 1896, pp. 105f.

[12] F. Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, vol. ii, Cambridge, 1904, p. 28.

[13] Ibid., p. 6; also pp. 5, 212.

[14] *Old Syriac Gospels*, pp. iv—vi.

[15] Ibid., p. v.

[16] Julius A. Bewer, "The History of the New Testament Canon in the Syrian Church," *American Journal of Theology*, IV (1900), 90.

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

However, in spite of the great merit of this order in making clear who was the high priest referred to in verse 19, and in fitting together the ordinarily separated parts of Peter's denials, and even in spite of the great weight which the early date of the text represented by this MS. gives to it as a witness to the original text, it seems highly probable that v. 16 was written to follow v. 15, and I therefore agree with Loisy[18] in calling this excellent presentation of the story a redaction of the traditional order.

I am thoroughly convinced, for reasons that will appear presently, that the order of the verses, as they left the pen of the author, was as follow : 12, 13, 24, 14, 19—23, 15—18, 25b—27. With this order there is no doubt that Caiaphas was the high priest who questioned Jesus, and the denials of Peter occur at one place and without any break. These advantages are had by the order of the Sinaitic Syriac, but with the order proposed just now there is the added advantage that verse 15 is directly followed by v. 16. If the order here proposed is right, we must ask, first, how the text came to be as it is found in the great majority of the MSS., and, secondly, how it could have got into the condition represented by the Sinaitic Syriac, which, as a very early witness, has especial right to consideration.

On counting the letters[19] in the two passages that have changed places, and allowing for all abbreviations that would have been in use in the first three centuries, we find that vv. 19—23 have 427 letters and that vv. 15—18 have 436 letters. Since it is probable that the earliest parts of the New Testament were written on small sheets and in columns of small dimensions, the remarkable agreement of these two numbers suggests that the origin of the trouble lay in misplacement of folia. It will be noted that, in the sequence as restored above, v. 18b stands just before v. 25 (of which the first part is virtually a repetition of 18b); in an early effort to make the story intelligible after it had been disarranged, v. 25a was almost certainly inserted in our texts from 18b by someone familiar with the author's trick of using "Simon Peter" for "Peter" when the apostle had been out the narrative for some time.[20]

---

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 457. It will be seen that my agreement with Loisy is not complete, for he says that the Sinaitic Syriac is a redaction of the original order. I say, a redaction of the traditional rather than of the original because, as will appear later, I believe that the order in the Sinaitic Syriac is the result of an emendation made in the line of its transmission after the displacements had occurred at an early date.

[19] The counting has been done from the text of Nestle. In the following paragraphs I am indebted to Albert C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1914, especially ch. i; *The Descent of Manuscripts*, Oxford, 1918, chh. i and ii.

Besides the interchange of vv. 19—23 and vv. 15—18 v. 24 has been transferred from the position indicated above to a position just before v. 25, where we are accustomed to find it. It is perhaps worth noting that, since v. 24 contains 55 letters, it may well have filled five of the eleven-letter lines of Clark's "primitive text." Whether the omitted v. 24 was inserted in its present place by the scribe who had at first omitted it, the indications of its proper place being overlooked by a later scribe, or whether it was written between the columns (either by the scribe who had omitted it or by a reader) and then found its way into the wrong column, as Mrs. Lewis at first believed to have been the case with the Sinaitic Syriac,[21] the error can be easily explained without supposing that there has been a jump of any definite number of lines or of a column or page. One is tempted, it is true, to connect the jump (which measures 938 letters) with the V pages of 234 letters discovered by Rendel Harris[22] behind the pages of the *Vaticanus* (234 × 4 = 936), especially since Rendel Harris himself believed that the autograph of John was written on V pages.[23] I cannot persuade myself, however, that, at least in the case of the Gospels, Rendel Harris's results give us data concerning the books of the New Testament as they left the pens of their authors (as the title *New Testament Autographs* would suggest), or that they give us reliable information about any stage of the transmission except that which directly preceded the *Sinaiticus* and the *Vaticanus*. If I am right, the transposition of verse 24 is not to be explained as a jump of four V pages, since this would not account for the fact that v. 24 is misplaced in nearly all of our MSS.

---

[20] Cf. Bernard, *op. cit.*, on xviii. 25.

[21] *Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest*, London, 1913, pp. 173ff.

[22] J. Rendel Harris, *New Testament Autographs* (Supplement to *American Journal of Philology*, No. 12), Baltimore, 1882.

[23] Ibid., p. 10.

To reconcile this original order with the fact that the Sinai Palimpsest, which has a text that probably dates from the middle of the second century, presents an order very similar, and very nearly as good, we must suppose that the two displacements discussed above were earlier than the translation into Syriac, for had they been later than this we should expect to find more traces of an order such as I have proposed or such as is found in the Sinaitic Syriac. When this Syriac translation was made, there was probably still a tradition of the original order, and this tradition may have inspired or assisted the translator in his emendation of the order found in the Greek MSS. from which he worked. To restore v. 24 to its proper position was comparatively easy. But in attempting to disentangle the trial and denial episodes, where, even with the help of a live tradition, the difficulty would have been far greater, the translator failed to see that verse 16 should follow verse 15, and he therefore fell one step short of the complete solution.

Additional support for the order of the Sinai Palimpsest is to be found, according to C. H. Turner,[24] in the *Evangelium Palatinum*,[25] from which has been cut out the folio containing the entire passage under discussion: folio 105b ends with the words *cohors itaque et tribunus et ministeria iudaeorum compraehenderunt* (18 12); folio 106a begins with the words *Dixerunt numquid et tu unus ex discentibus* (18 25). From the circumstance that the matter omitted amounts to twenty-seven lines of Westcott and Hort text, whereas the average contained in the folia of the *Palatinus* is twenty-one or twenty-two lines, Turner concludes that the removed folio must have contained the story as it is in the Sinai MS., which lacks verse 25a and certain other words and phrases found in Westcott and

---

[24] *Journal of Theological Studies*, II (1901), 141f.

[25] Ed. Constantinus Tischendorf, Lipsiae, 1847.

Hort. He is inclined to believe that the reason why the page was cut out was that it exhibited an order not in keeping with the majority. On the other hand Burkitt[26] produces a bit of evidence which he believes shows that in this MS. the trial was conducted by Annas, as in the ordinary text: in v. 28 the *Palatinus* has *ad Caiaphan* in agreement with the majority of Latin MSS., while the Sinaitic Syriac has *a Caiapha*. We have seen that in the Syriac Jesus is taken to Annas, sent on to Caiaphas, who conducts the trial, and then sent on to the Praetorium. But according to the Latin MSS. that have *ad* for *a* in v. 28, Jesus does not go to the house of Caiaphas at all, but Caiaphas appears to meet the prisoner outside the Praetorium. Since the *Palatinus* is among those which have *ad* for *a*, and therefore in it Jesus does not meet Caiaphas until both have arrived just outside the Praetorium, Burkitt concludes that in the missing folio the trial must have been conducted by Annas, as in the ordinary text, and not by Caiaphas, as in the Sinaitic Syriac. In a count that I made of the letters at this place,[27] I found that, where the folio was missing, the omitted letters numbered approximately 1087; the average number for the folia of this MS. is about 908. This difference is even greater than would be necessary to give support to the view that the folio contained the Sinaitic Syriac order, for the number of letters corresponding to the omissions in the Sinai palimpsest is 157, and this brings the quantity of writing that would have been contained in the missing folio to 930.[28] The whole matter is rather uncertain, for the lines are not of sufficient constancy in length to give accurate results by counting, and, what is more, the frequency of omissions in MSS. reduces evidence of this sort to little more than speculation. The important consideration here is not so much the absolute validity of the facts of this investigation, but rather this: if something was lacking in the text of the missing folio of the *Palatinus*, as seems to be the case, it was most probably v. 25a; nothing can be inferred about the order of the rest of the passage. And, since v. 25a does not occur either in the order of the Sinai palimpsest or in the order herein set forth, whatever evidence the *Evangelium Palatinum* may have applies equally to the two arrangements under consideration.

---

[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 316.

[27] In estimating the number of letters that were in the lost folio I have used the vulgate text. A comparison of the two texts will show that I am justified in doing this. Scrivener says (*Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, Frederick H. Scrivener, Cambridge, 1864, pp. xxxviiif.): "The vulgate is plainly the groundwork of *e*, and it plainly lay before the writer while engaged in his task."

[28] Mrs. Lewis lists these omissions on several occasions. See either *Old Syriac Gospels*, p. lxxvii, or *A Translation of the Four Gospels from the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, London, 1894, p. 229.

It is also true that all the other support that may be summoned to the Sinaitic Syriac from the ancient authorities applies with the same force to the order set forth herein, for this evidence is concerned only with the transposition of v. 24 and the omission of v. 25a, features common to the two orders. The difference between the two orders lies only in the fact that the Sinaitic Syriac indicates that the groups of vv. 19—23 and 16—18 were interchanged, while the order herein maintained indicates that the groups 19—23 and 15—18 were interchanged. Since, therefore, there is no ancient evidence to support either one of these two orders rather than the other, with the exception of the excellent testimony borne by the Sinaitic Syriac itself, this single witness would certainly be sufficient for me, as it has been for so many others, were it not for the considerations set forth above: that the passages 19—23 and 15—18, containing virtually the same quantity of writing, point to the probable accidental interchange of leaves at an early period; that in order for the passage to be consistent and to agree with the accounts of Matthew and Mark v. 24 must precede v. 19; and that, since v. 16 should follow v. 15, it is probable that v. 24 should directly follow v. 13. These considerations lead me to believe that the order which I have set forth and attempted to defend is the order in which the narrative was written by the author.

RABBINIC EXEGESIS IN THE VULGATE OF PROVERBS

CYRUS H. GORDON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHURCH Fathers, interested in understanding the Hebrew Scriptures, found it expedient to take rabbis as their teachers. Thus Jewish tradition made its way into Patristic literature, as Graetz long ago demonstrated[1]. Monographs have since appeared showing the rabbinic exegesis adopted by individual Church Fathers such as Justin Martyr,[2] Aphraates,[3] Ephraem Syrus,[4] Hippolytus,[5] etc. Professor Louis Ginzberg proved and illustrated the existence of Haggada in both Patristica and Apocrypha.[6] Of all the Church Fathers, St. Jerome enjoyed the most intimate intellectual contact with rabbis and hence his compositions are particularly replete with their interpretations.

---

[1] *Haggadische Elemente bei den Kirchenvätern*, MGWJ, 1854, III, p. 311ff. Cp. Grünwald, *Das Verhältniss der Kirchenväter zur talmudischen und midraschischen Literatur*, in *Königsberger's Monatsblätter* and reprinted, *Jung-Bunzlau*, 1891.

[2] Goldfahn, *Just. Mart. und die Aggada*, MGWJ, 1873, p. 49ff.

[3] Funk, *Die hagg. Elemente in den Homilien des Aphraates*, 1891.

[4] Gerson, *Die Comment. d. Ephr. Syr. in Verhältnis zur jüd. Exegese*, MGWJ, 1878, p. 40ff.

[5] Cp. Montgomery, *Daniel* (International Critical Commentary), New York, 1927, p. 42; and Salmond, article *Hippolytus*, in *A Dict. of Christian Biog.*

[6] *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern*, Erster Theil: *Die Haggada in pseudohieronymianischen "Quaestiones,"* Amsterdam, 1899; and *Die Haggada bei d. Kirchenvätern und in d. apokryphischen Literatur*, Berlin, 1900.

It will be recalled that while the Septuagint was the Church Version, the Old Latin gradually grew up to meet the needs of the western Christian laity.[7] Jerome, finding this pre-Origenic Old Latin Bible in a very corrupt state, perceived the necessity of having a reliable Latin Version. He further realized that such a Version ought to be on the basis of the original Hebrew and not of the Septuagint or Old Latin texts. To learn the sacred language, he studied under Palestinian rabbis and so became well acquainted with their exposition of the Old Testament—hence the rabbinic exegesis patent in the Vulgate.

To Dr. Moritz Rahmer belongs the credit for initiating the study of Jewish tradition in the Bible Commentaries of Jerome[8]. Rahmer has contributed an excellent bit of work, but, being a pioneer, he committed some pardonable errors. He considers, for the most part, the Jewish tradition in the Yalkut and Midrash Rabba, neglecting other important midrashim, the Talmuds and Targum. On page fifty of his booklet on the *Quaestiones in Genesin*, he points out that Jerome there rejects the translation of אברך (41 43) as *kneel* and instead follows the Hebraei, who render it *pater tener* (i. e., אב רך in two words). Assuming (incorrectly) that the *Quaestiones* were composed simultaneously with the Genesis Vulgate, Rahmer concluded that the two should tally. But, in the Vulgate, אברך is rendered *kneel.* To Rahmer this was proof that 𝔙 (Vulgate), in its present form, is hopelessly corrupt. As a matter of fact, the *Quaestiones in Genesin* preceded the Genesis Vulgate by ten or fifteen years, and so their author had ample time to change his mind. This oversight of Rahmer's caused him to make similar mistakes several times (e. g., p. 61).

---

[7] See the Introduction of Blondheim's *Les Parlers Judéo-Romains et la Vetus Latina*, Paris, 1925; and on 𝔏 in general, see Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala*, Cambridge, 1896.

[8] *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus*, I: *Die Quaestiones in Genesin*, Breslau, 1861; II, Berlin, 1898; idem, in *Ben Chananja*, VII; idem, in *Monatsschrift*, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868; idem, in *Grätz Jubelschrift*, 1887.

Among the Jewish scholars, Samuel Krauss deserves mention in the study of rabbinic elements in Jerome's writings. Krauss, however, does not limit himself to Jerome alone, but instead is interested in all the Church Fathers.[9] He emphasizes (some would say he magnifies) the importance of Jewish influence on Jerome. In perfect contrast to Krauss, is the position taken by A. Condamin,[10] who minimizes the influence of the rabbis upon the Church Father and his works: "Il ne faut pas oublier les 'cas beaucoup plus nombreux' où, comme le remarque le P. Lagrange,[11] il a 'résisté aux influences rabbiniques'"; or again: "Mais, dans ses commentaires, à côté des interprétations juives qu'il admet, combien d'autres de même source sur lesquelles il ne se prononce pas, ou qu'il méprise comme absurdes, qu'il rejette comme impies!" (p. 20).[12] Condamin is certainly wrong in concluding from Jerome's omitting much of rabbinic exegesis that his writings are fundamentally devoid of

---

[9] *The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, V, 1892, pp. 122—157; VI, 1893, pp. 82—99, and 225—261; *A zsidók Szt-Jeromos müveiben*, in *Magyár Zsidó Szemlé*, VII, 1890, pp. 267—271, 334—345, 385—403; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, IV, 80—86 (article *Church Fathers*), *and* VII, 115—118 (article *Jerome*).

[10] *L'influence de la tradition juive dans la version de Saint Jérôme*, in *Recherches de science religieuse*, V, 1914, pp. 1—21.

[11] *Saint Jérôme et la tradition juive dans la Genèse*, in *Revue Biblique*, 1898, pp. 563—566.

[12] Condamin has collected passages where Jerome insults the Jews and their learning in every way (*op. cit.*, p. 3). The Church Father had, unfortunately, a very bad temper and consequently he was occupied in polemics against many—even against fellow Christians. In a more affable mood he writes that he knew Jews who lived beautiful, unselfish and godly lives such as is the ideal of Christianity (*Liber contra Vigilantium*, c. 14, in Vall. ^{28}, II, 399). Below, e. g. in footnote 79, is evidence of his high opinion of rabbis' knowledge of Scriptures. We can only understand the Father's diametrically opposed sentiments concerning Israel by discerning in him abnormal fluctuation of sympathies and antipathies. He was friendly toward erudite rabbis, for good fellowship and scholarly intercourse exist among learned men in all lands, in every age and regardless of party feelings. Moreover, he expresses kind sentiments toward all Israel, saying that Christians may give charity to poor Jews (*Ep. 70 ad Hedibiam*, Vall., I, 820) and that Israel was still God's chosen people (*JQR*, VI, 229). Most important of all is that he gave his life to Jewish scholarship, a fact which outweighs all else.

Jewish tradition. Influence can only be measured positively in such a case.

Adequate sections on and copious examples of Jewish influence on Jerome are available in the comprehensive books of Zöckler[13] and Grützmacher.[14] However, almost all the scholars who treat the problem, deal with the commentaries and pass over the Vulgate. (A partial exception must be made in the case of Aptowitzer's article referred to below.) Some (so Condamin, op. cit., pp. 5 and 20) hold that Jerome cites rabbinic interpretations in his commentaries without himself accepting them, and, accordingly, avoids them in his translation, the Vulgate. Because 𝔙, as a whole, remains untreated from this standpoint, a systematic study of 𝔙 must be made, before the relation of rabbinic exegesis to the Vulgate can be definitely settled. Effort expended in this study is doubly justified in that it will shed light on both the Haggada and Patristics. The interrelation of these two fields forms a fascinating chapter in the history of the Church and Synagogue.

I have selected Proverbs because it is the type of book which would oblige Jerome to seek explanation from his Jewish masters; and because, by dint of its purely ethical (and therefore universally acceptable) nature, theological scruples would not prevent him from incorporating their exegesis. By the nature of the case, the data resulting from this study will not consist wholly of irrefutable facts. To the contrary, the better part of the results must be expected to supply us with cumulative evidence rather than proof-positive. Nevertheless, we hope to supply the reader with some convincing information.

---

[13] *Hieronymus — Sein Leben und Wirken*, Gotha, 1865. Although this book is scholarly and useful, Zöckler has made one error, which requires correction. Attempting to prove that Jerome was "ein ziemlich kundiger und gewandter Hebräer," Zöckler states that the Hebraei, with whom the Father associated, knew only Hebrew and Aramaic and could understand very little Latin or Greek; therefore, he must have conversed in Hebrew with them (p. 352). This argument is invalid because learned Hebraei knew Greek and even Latin (cp. *JQR*, VI, p. 233; see below, footnote 68, on the attainments of one of his Hebraei, known as Lyddaeus).

[14] *Hieronymus — Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*; I, Leipzig, 1901; II, Berlin, 1906; III, Berlin, 1908.

I. 𝔙[15] *against the Versions but with Rabbinic Exegesis*

a) *Exemplary Cases.* A striking example of rabbinic exegesis, embodied by Jerome, is present at Pr. 26 8. For כצרור אבן במרגמה (כן־נותן לכסיל כבוד), 𝔙 reads *sicut qui mittet lapidem in acervum Mercurii*, meaning that showing a fool respect is as futile as adding a stone to great heaps of stones such as were dedicated to Mercury.[16] It is interesting to note that a similar ritual is enjoined upon Islam in the Ḥadith.[17] Stummer, stating that Jewish tradition and 𝔊 (Septuagint) interpret מרגמה as *a sling*, makes this a case of Jerome introducing a reference to Roman civilization in order to adapt his work for Roman readers.[18] It is a fact that 𝔙 at times bears Roman coloring; e. g., at 31 23, עם־זקני־ארץ, *cum senatoribus terrae.* However, here, at 26 8, we have no case of this, and Stummer is entirely in error; for, indeed, the following Jewish interpretation, beyond any doubt, underlies 𝔙: "Ḥama bar Ḥanina said that one who benefits him who does not know it, is as one who throws a stone to *Mercury*"[19] (Yalk.,[20] ad. loc.; cp. Ḥullin, 133a[21]). It is interesting to speculate about the possibility of Ḥama bar Ḥanina personally imparting to the Church Father the explanation of מרגמה as *acervus Mercurii.* For, according to Moritz Rahmer,[22] Baranina, whom Jerome names as a Hebrew teacher of his, is Ḥama bar Ḥanina. It must be confessed, however, that there were many bar Ḥaninas and even more than one Ḥama bar Ḥanina[23] with the result that certain identification is unattainable.

---

[15] Tischendorf, *Biblia Sacra Latina Veteris Testamenti*, Leipzig, 1873.

[16] See A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, Vienna, 1926, V, 262, sub מרקולים.

[17] L. Krehl, *Le Recueil des Traditions Mohamétans par el-Bokhâri*, Leyden, 1862, I, 437; Bab 135, 136, 137; etc.

[18] *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Anhang I contains Jerome's introductions to the Biblical Books), Paderborn, 1928, p. 111, footnote 1.

[19] א״ר חמא בר חנינא כל העושה טובה למי שאינו יודעה כזורק אבן למרקלים.

[20] *Yalkut Shimʿoni*, Wilna, 1909.

[21] *Talmud Babli*, Wilna, 1902.

[22] *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus*, I: *Die Quaestiones in Genesin*, Breslau, 1861; see the introduction entitled: *Hieronymus und seine jüdischen Lehrer.*

At 8 30 (cp. Wisdom of Sol., 7 22), the problematic אמון is translated in 𝔙 by *cuncta componens.* Gen. Rab.,[24] at 1 1, tells us that אמון has four connotations; to wit, pedagogue, sheltering, well-guarded, and great;[25]—the last squares with 𝔙. This interpretation reached Saadia,[26] who translates ג̇מהורא *completely.*[27] Our hypothesis that 𝔙 is here influenced by rabbinic exegesis can be substantiated by additional evidence. At Nah. 3 8, for נא אמון, 𝔙 has *Alexandria populorum* and 𝔗 (Targum), *Alexandria the great.* In his commentary on Nah. 3 8 (Vall.,[28] VI, 570), Jerome writes: "Hebraeus,[29] qui me in Scripturis erudivit, ita legi posse asseruit:

---

[23] See A. Hyman, *Sefer Toledot Tannaim we-Amoraim*, London, 1910; II, 460 and 461.

[24] *Midrash Rabba*, Warsaw, 1911.

[25] Repeated in Yalkut, ad. loc. (in Prov.), thus: ואהיה אצלו אמון. אמון פדגוג אמון מכוסה אמון מוצנע אית דאמרי אמון רבתא כמה דאת אמר התיטבי מנוא אמון (Nah. 3 8) ומתרגמינן האת טבא מאלכסנדריא רבתא.

[26] J. Derenbourg, *Oeuvres Complètes de Saadia*, IV (Proverbes), Paris, 1894.

[27] Derenbourg explains: אמון כמו המון בחילוף ה"א באלף. It is interesting to note that ג̇מהור (in Maimonide's Guide for the Perplexed) is rendered המון by Ibn Tibbon (see *Moreh Nebukim*, Wilna, 1905, p. 6a, last line).

[28] The best edition of Jerome's works is that by Vallarsi, Venice, 1766 to 1771.

[29] By "Hebraeus", Jerome does not mean any Jew taken at random, as Condamin (L'influence de la tradition juive dans la version de Saint Jérôme, in *Recherches de science religieuse*, V, 1914, pp. 1—21) implies by translating "quemlibet Hebraeorum", "n' importe quel juif" (p. 2). The Church Father applies "Hebraeus" to "Jew *qua* Hebrew scholar," as against "Judaeus", which signifies "n' importe quel juif." A proof of this is the equation of "Hebraei" with "rabbis," in the *Pref. to Pent. ad Desid.* (text in Stummer, *op. cit.*, p. 234): " . . . interroga Hebraeos, diversarum urbium magistros (i. e., rabbis) consule." Furthermore, that "Hebraeus" refers to education rather than creed is obvious from *Adv. Ruf.*, III, c. 6 (Vall., II, 537) where Jerome calls himself "Hebraeus, Graecus, Latinus, trilinguis." Cp. "Chaldaeus," the sobriquet of his instructor in Aramaic.

'*numquid melior es quam No Amon,*' et ait, Hebraice NO dici *Alexandriam*, AMON autem *multitudinem* sive *populos*." This citation shows that Jerome discussed אמון with a rabbi. Because of this and because 𝔙, the midrash and Saadia agree; it is likely that the Saint follows the Hebraei and did not consciously emend his text to המון as modern commentators contend.

23 29—למי אבוי—*cuius patri vae*; i. e., 𝔙 divides אבוי into אב אוי = Nu. Rab., 88b: זה אב אוי; or Yalk., ad. loc.: "This alludes to the drunkard—*woe* to his house and to his *fathers*."

13 23—ויש נספה (בלא משפט)—*et aliis congregantur*. Contrast AV., RV.[30]: "but there is that is destroyed;" or JV.: "swept away." 𝔙, reading נאספה, signifies *assembled* or *collected unto others*. Cp. Gen. Rab., 57b, where נספה is also taken in the sense of collecting: "R. Samlai asked R. Jonathan the meaning of ויש נספה בלא משפט. He replied: 'Without the judgment of one's place.' There is a story about a man who was sent to collect taxes from the people of Tiberias and Sepphoris. While collecting in Tiberias, he saw a man from Sepphoris. The collector took him and requested that he pay tax, whereupon the latter objected on the ground that he was from Sepphoris. The collector answered: 'I have orders to collect it from Sepphoris.' The man accordingly paid; but before the collector had finished with Tiberias, Sepphoris was exempted from paying the tax. Hence we have a case of that which is collected without the judgment of one's place."[31] It is more than likely that this midrash has affected 𝔙; the resemblance is too close to be capricious.

20 25—מוקש אדם ילע קדש ואחר נדרים לבקר[32]—*ruina est homini*

---

[30] Edition of the American Revision Committee, New York, 1901; it is generally called *The American Standard Revision*.

[31] ר' שמלאי שאליה לר' יונתן מאי דכתיב ויש נספה בלא משפט א"ל בלא משפט מקומו מעשה באחד שנשתלח לגבות מס מבני טבריא ובני צפורי כשהיה גובה בטבריא ראה אחד מציפורי עמד ותפשו א"ל מציפורי אני א"ל יש בידי כתבים מציפורי לגבותה ולא הספיק לגבות בני טבריא עד שבאת רוחה לציפורי ונמצא נספה בלא משפט מקומו.

[32] בקר, here, is probably to be connected with the Akkadian baḳâru "raise a claim against, *vindicare*;" cp. Kohler und Ungnad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, Leipzig, 1909, II, p. 127.

devorare sanctos, et post vota retractare. The translation of ילע as *devorare* is confirmed by Gen. Rab., 95b; and by Sa.,[26] Qimḥi[33] and Ral.[34] (Ralbag or Gersonides), ad loc. However, the general sense of the entire verse in 𝔐, which pivots on לבקר "retractare," depends on rabbinic law. לבקר, according to this interpretation, is connected with הבקר (or הפקר), the Talmudic term for *neutral property.* The verse thus purports that one should not make property neutral, after having devoted it to the temple, for the purpose of using it to his own advantage, thus breaking his sacred vow (cp. Mark 7 11—13). Jerome is doubtless subscribing to the rabbinic explanation of this passage: "A curse comes to anyone who derives personal benefit from devoted goods"[35] (Gen. Rab., 95b).

7 13—העזה פניה ותאמר לו—*et procaci vultu "blanditur" dicens.* To detect the rabbinic coloring here is somewhat difficult. אמר, according to the rabbis, denotes gentle speech as opposed to דבר (e. g., Tan.[36] on Ex. 32 7) or הגיד (e. g., Rashi on Ex. 19 3[37]), which, as they claim, signify severe speech. Following this traditional interpretation, Jerome translates ותאמר, "speaking *blandly.*"

31 4—ולרוזנים אֵו שכר—*quia nullum secretum* (i. e., רזים instead of רוזנים) *est ubi regnat ebrietas.* Cp. Sanhedrin, 70b, where this passage is explained: "He to whom all the *secrets* of the universe are disclosed."[38]

3 27–אל־תמנע־טוב מבעליו–*Noli prohibere benefacere eum, qui potest* = "If you see the other fellow desiring to benefit the poor, do not restrain him"[39] (Rashi). מבעליו is generally translated "from

---

[33] i. e., the commentary of Moses Qimḥi on Proverbs, which is in the *Miqraot Gedolot* under the name of Ibn Ezra; see S. R. Driver, *A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* —, Oxford, 1880, pp. Vff.

[34] *Miqraot Gedolot,* Warsaw, 1864; containing the commentaries of Rashi, Moses Qimḥi (see preceeding note), and Ralbag; the Targum; etc.

[35] תבא מארה לאדם שהוא אוכל קדשים כלועו.

[36] *Midrash Tanḥuma,* Warsaw, 1910. The above citation reads: ואין וַיְדַבֵּר האמור כאן אלא קשות שנאמר (בראשית מב) דבר האיש אדוני הארץ אתנו קשות.

[37] לבית יעקב. אלו הנשים תאמר להם בלשון רכה: ותגיד לבני ישראל עונשין ודקדוקים פרש לזכרים דברים הקשים כגידין (מכילתא).

[38] מי שכל רזי עולם גלוים לו cp. Yalkut ad loc., etc.

[39] אם ראית חבירך חפץ להטיב לעניים אל תמנעהו.

those to whom it (i. e., good) is due" or hence, "the poor" (so 𝔊). 𝔙 and Rashi, however, agree in rendering מבעליו "from him who can do good." A proper question at this juncture is: Have we any right to say that Jerome follows a Jewish tradition, just because a rabbi, centuries later, records the same interpretation?—The material now recorded in rabbinic literature was, in Jerome's day, oral. As might be suspected, not all the Haggada, which the Church Father's *Hebraei* knew, but only some of it has been committed to writing. Some early, unwritten midrashim persisted orally, reaching the medieval commentators, who were the first Jews to record them. Therefore, the Church Fathers, and in particular Jerome, now and then record traditions that prove the antiquity of haggadic material, which would otherwise have to be considered late. We shall see more examples of this presently.

b) *Remaining Cases.*

3 33——מארת—*egestas*; i. e., Jerome specifies 𝔐 "curse" as "poverty" = Qimḥi. Nu. Rab., 94a, mentions the *poverty* of Edom as illustrating this מארה.

4 26—מעגל רגלך "פלס"—"*dirige*" *semitam pedibus tuis*; cp. Sa. סקם מסלך קדמך "*Règle* [?] *le sentier que suivra ton pied.*" Contrast EVV.

9 13—פתיות (folly)—*plenaque illecebris (and full of enticements).* Cp. Nu. Rab., 88b: "She adds sinners among men because she entices (מפתה) good men and makes them sinners and increases the wicked in Israel." It is curious that this midrash reads מפתה, which is the emendation for פתיות suggested by Toy,[40] among other modern scholars.

10 21—רבים "ירעו" שפתי צדיק—*labia iusti "erudiunt" plurimos* (cp. below on 19 18, p. 393). Perhaps 𝔙 reads ידְעוּ for ירעו. It is more likely however, that 𝔙 represents ירעו according to the Jewish allegorical interpretation recorded also by Qimḥi. The rabbis considered Torah the "food" par excellence (see Ḥagiga, 14a; Gen. Rab., 49a, 63b; and Ex. Rab., 184a) and, consequently, רעה "feed" comes to be allegorized as "teach."

---

[40] International Critical Commentary, *Proverbs*, New York, 1902.

10 21—ואוילים—*qui autem indocti sunt*; i. e., 𝔙 has "the ignorant" instead of 𝔐 "fools." 𝔙 = Sa. = Ralbag.

11 17—ועכר שארו—*etiam propinquos abiicit*. In limiting 𝔐 "flesh" to "relatives," 𝔙 is in harmony with Sa. and Rashi (cp. Symmachus).

13 19—ותועבת כסילים סור מרע—*detestantur stulti "eos, qui" fugiunt mala*; i. e., סור is taken as סָר, or more exactly סָרִים. Qimḥi may well have heard a tradition which some Hebraeus had long before told Jerome. Note Qimḥi: ותועבת כסילים מי שהוא סור (!) מעשות רע "that which is hated by fools is *he who* is turned away from doing evil." We should certainly expect Qimḥi to use סָר instead of סור; סור can here be taken as a passive participle but the resulting construction is far from graceful.

14 14—ומעליו איש טוב—*et super eum erit vir bonus* = Sa. Contrast 𝔊 or AV.

14 35—(רצון־מלך לעבד משכיל) ועברתו תהיה מביש—*iracundiam eius inutilis sustinebit*. Cp. Ralbag: "And the rage of the king is against the servant who is slow in moving and sluggish in going whither he is sent."[41]

19 18—יסר—*erudi*. The intellectual coloring of 𝔙 (i. e., "educate" as against "discipline")—which is forced, in violation of the parallel second stichos—is also found in Mid. Mish.,[42] ad loc.: "Chastise him with words of Torah to save him from Gehenna in the future life." (Cp. above on "erudiunt," 10 21, p. 392.)

21 17—שמחה—*epulas*. It might be argued that 𝔙 renders 𝔐 "joy" as "feasts," because the parallel second stichos speaks of food. Rabbinic exegesis, however, justifies the stand of 𝔙, irrespective of context: "R. Judah ben Betira said that when the temple stood, there was no שמחה other than feasting"[43] (Yalkut, p. 618, col. 2,—quoting Pesaḥim, 109a).

[41] ועברת המלך הוא בעבד מאוחר התנועה ובושש בלכת באשר ישולח.

[42] Salomon Buber, *Midrasch Mischlé*, Wilna, 1893. The passage referred to reads:

ואמר ר׳ ישמעאל יסרהו בדברי תורה כדי שתצילהו מדינה של גיהנם לעתיד לבא.

[43] ר׳ יהודה בן בתירא אומר בזמן שבהמ׳ קיים אין שמחה אלא בבשר שנאמר וזבחת שלמים ואכלת שם ושמחת לפני ה׳ אלהיך (Deut. 27 7).

24 7—ראמות (לאויל חכמות) “corals”—*excelsa.* Cp. Lev. Rab., 28a: “If a loaf of bread is suspended in the air in a house, the fool asks, ‘Who can bring it down?’ (i. e., it is too high). The wide awake person remarks, ‘Did not somebody hang it up?’ Then he brings a couple of reeds, ties them together and fetches it down. Similarly, the fool asks, ‘Who can learn the Torah, that is in the heart of a sage?’ But the wide awake man says, ‘Did he not learn it from someone else? I am learning a couple of halakot today and a couple tomorrow and so on until I master the entire Torah’.”

25 15—(ולשון רכה תשבר־) גרם—*duritiam.* 𝔊 “bone” is likewise interpreted metaphorically in Ex. Rab., 177b: Moses was interceding with God on Israel’s behalf. For a while He displayed severity. “Moses did not succeed in cancelling the punishment immediately. ‘By patience is a ruler persuaded and a gentle tongue breaketh severity’ (Pr., 25 15). Then God began to give Moses ways in which he could seek mercy for Israel.” See also Ral.

25 28—איש אשר אין־מעצר לרוחו—*ita vir qui non potest “in loquendo” cohibere spiritum suum.* Qimḥi similarly specifies רוח as “talking.”

27 15—ביום סגריר—*in die frigoris* = Sa. יום זמהריר as against 𝔊 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Χειμερινῇ = £[44] *in die hiemali.* Rashi, commenting on Yebamot 63b, defines יום ס׳ as יום ברד ורוח. (The VSS. that render ס׳ as “coldness,” connect it with קרר in a quasi סַפְעֶל formation. EVV., “in a very rainy day,” derive ס׳ from סגר; i. e., the day when people are “closed” indoors.)

27 24—כי לא לעולם חסן ואם־נזר לדור ודור—*non enim habebis iugiter potestatem “sed” corona tribuetur in generationem et generationem.* לא---אם means “neither --- nor.” Jerome’s weakness in Hebrew grammar[45] is illustrated by this mistranslation. It is of interest to note, however, that a learned rabbi makes the same mistake; to wit, מהרש״א on Sanhedrin, 7b: “--- the crown and rule *is* from generation to generation, from father to son and grandson as was the case of the kings of David’s line.”

---

[44] Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus Italica,* Rome, 1751.

[45] W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik,* Göttingen, 1875, pp. 8—10.

27 19—כמים הפנים לפנים—*quomodo in aquis resplendent vultus prospicientium* = Mid. Mish.[46] and Yalkut, ad loc. Contrast 𝔊, noting that the Saint breaks away from the accepted interpretation and embraces Jewish exegesis.

28 10—טוב—*bona* "*eius*"; i. e., good men shall inherit the goods of the deceiver (who is mentioned in the first stichos) = Qimḥi.

28 21—יפשע—*deserit veritatem.* Sa. presents an odd analogy in translating יפשע by the Arabic יכפר "to deny the true faith, etc."

31 8—כל־בני חלוף—*omnium filiorum qui pertranseunt*; cp. Saadia: "all who pass on."

II. The Affinities of 𝔙 *with* 𝔖[47] 𝔗[48]

All Targumim contain Haggada, though in varying degree. The Targum of Proverbs is a loose rendering of the Syriac Version[49]; and, out of 915 verses, about three hundred are the same in both 𝔗 and 𝔖. The Syriac O. T. itself may well be of Jewish origin[50] because (1) it is essentially based on ℌ and not on a Church Version, because (2) it originally lacked the Apocrypha and contained only the orthodox Jewish canon, and because (3) it betrays rabbinic exegesis. In considering the contacts obtaining between 𝔙 and 𝔖 𝔗, we must understand clearly the following two facts about these VSS. as regards rabbinic exegesis: (1) 𝔖, and 𝔗 which follows it, are more valuable when independent of 𝔊; (2) 𝔗, when deviating from 𝔖, is truer to Jewish tradition than otherwise, because 𝔗 has been exclusively in Jewish hands throughout its separate existence. Jerome, despite his associations with Hebraei, never mentions a

---

[46] אמר ר׳ חנינא וכי מים פנים יש להם אלא מה המים הללו אדם נותנן בכלי ומסתכל בהן והן נראין לך.

[47] S. Lee, *Vetus Testamentum Syriace*, London, 1823.

[48] In *Miqraot Gedolot*, Warsaw, 1864; also Lagarde's critical edition, *Hagiographa Chaldaica*, Leipzig, 1873.

[49] For 𝔖 on Proverbs, see Leo Haefeli, *Die Peschitta des alten Testaments*, in *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*, Band XI, Heft I, 1927, pp. 41—44.

[50] Joshua Bloch, *The Authorship of the Peshitta*, Amer. Jour. of Sem. Lang. and Lit., XXXV, pp. 215—222; D. S. Blondheim, *Les Parlers Judéo-Romains et la Vetus Latina*, Paris, 1925, pp. LXVIII—LXIX; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.*, Edinburgh, 1892, pp. 185—187.

Targum, in either written or oral form. The Church Fathers often write of *Σύρος*, but to what this refers is in doubt. However, that 𝔙 has affinities with the Targumim is certain.

a) Cases of 𝔙 running with 𝔗 against the other VSS.

14 7—ובל־ידעת שפתי־דעת—"et nesc*it* labia prudentiae." Toy suggests that the third person in 𝔙 is a scribal error, but 𝔗, דלית בשפותיה ידיעתא, agrees with 𝔙 in this particular.

18 6—למהלמות—*iurgia*; cp. 𝔗 לחרתא "strife" or "anger" (Lag. הרתא "ligitatio").

23 29—שיח—fovea = 𝔗 שוחא.[51]

b) Passages where 𝔙, 𝔖 and 𝔗 tally against 𝔊.

3 32—סודו—*sermocinatio eius* = 𝔖 שוֹעִיתה = 𝔗 (cp. Am. 3 7 for the personal contact existing between God and good men).

8 3—תרנה—*loquitur* "*dicens*." This plus is also in 𝔖 משתבחא ואמרא = 𝔗.

8 10—נבחר (adj.)—*eligite* (imperat.) = 𝔖 וגבו = 𝔗.

8 26—וחוצות—*et flumina* (!) = 𝔖 ונחֿלא = 𝔗.

9 3—תקרא—"*ut* vocar*ent*"; cp. 𝔖 דנקרון and 𝔗 דתקרין (Lag. דניקריין). Note the plural number of the verb and the identity of *ut* and ד.

11 14—תחבלות—*gubernator* = 𝔖 מדברנא or 𝔗 מדברא. 𝔙 is not the same as 𝔊 *κυβέρνησις* = 𝔏 gubernatio. At 1 5 and 20 18, however, 𝔙 reads *gubernacula* for this Hebrew word.

19 27—לשגות מאמרי־דעת—*nec ignores sermones scientiae.* The insertion of a negative is likewise present in 𝔖 ולא תטעא מאמרא דידעתא and in 𝔗 ולא תשנא[52] מן מאמרי דפומי.

20 6—רב־אדם יִקְרָא איש חסדו—*multi homines misercordes "vocantur*". This passive construction is reminiscent of 𝔖 סוגאא דבני̈נשא מתקרין גברא מרחמנא = 𝔗.

29 1—איש תוכחות מקשה־ערף—*viro qui corripientem dura cervice*

---

[51] Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, Choreb edition, 1926, p. 962: "סוּחָא—*that which is thrown out, dirt, disgusting matter.* Targ. Prov. 23 29 ed. Compl. (ed. Lag. סוודא, Var. סְוֵירָא; ed. Wil. שוּחָא—)."

[52] 𝔗, throughout Proverbs, is prone to break away from 𝔖 and become partially assimilated to ℌ.

contemnit; cp. 𝔖 גברא דלא מקבל מכסנותא וקשה קדלה=𝔗. 𝔙, 𝔖, 𝔗 and the Jewish commentators agree in understanding this stichos as "the man who refuses correction with a stiff neck." (𝔙, however, has "corrector" instead of "correction"). 𝔊, by assuming a different vocalization of מקשה reads "better is a rebuking man than a stiff necked one." But, even keeping the Massoretic vowels, we might translate: "a man who reproves but is stubborn." Yet, rabbinic tradition, followed by Jerome, adheres to one interpretation, to the exclusion of others.

c) 𝔙 agrees with 𝔖 against the other VSS. in just one instance; namely, at 11 24—וחשך מישר אך־למחסור—*alii "rapiunt non sua" et semper in egestate sunt*; cp. 𝔖 ואית "דדלא דילה מכנש" וזעור הו לה. 𝔗 here attaches itself to tj, as often in Proverbs; e. g., also at 27 15, where for 𝔐 ביום סגריר, 𝔖 reads ביומא דסגרא but 𝔗, ביומא דסגרירא.

III. 𝔙 and the Hexapla

St. Jerome was fortunate in having access to the ill-fated Hexapla of Origen, which, if not the original, was at least a very careful copy made under the supervision of Pamphilus.[53] In his writings, especially in the Bible commentaries, the Saint makes frequent mention of the Hexapla and its component parts, particularly the translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. These three Versions contain, in varying degree, rabbinic exegesis; and, apropos of this, note Jerome's *Preface to Job* (Stummer, *op. cit.*, 247): "Judaeus Aquila, Symmachus et Theodotio iudaizantes haeretici."

a) *Aquila.*—According to the Jerusalem Talmud, Aquila was a Jewish proselyte and wrote his Version under the guidance of Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua.[54] Jerome, however, reports a tradition that R. Akiba (c. 100 A.D.) taught Aquila.[55] The probability of this is enhanced by the fact that the slavishness of Aquila's translation is in harmony with the teachings of Akiba, who magnified the importance of details, stressing even the significance of syllables and letters. When the Jews rejected all translations of the Scriptures (other than the Targumim), an exception was made in the case of Aquila, which continued to be used[56] by dint of its being *κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν*[57]—true to the letter of the original Hebrew. The only ways Jerome had of finding the definition of a Hebrew word in the Bible, were to ask a Hebraeus or consult the meticulous work of Aquila.

---

[53] O. Zöckler, *Hieronymus — Sein Leben und Wirken*, Gotha, 1865, p. 180: "Pamphilus presbyter, tanto bibliothecae divinae flagravit amore, ut maximam partem Origenis voluminum sua manu scripserit, quae usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca habentur."

[54] *Talmud Yerushalmi*, Wilna, 1922, Megilla, Perek I, Halaka 9, on p. 20b: תירגם עקילס הגר התורה לפני רבי אליעזר ולפני רבי יהושע וקילסו אותו

In noting the relation of 𝔙 to *α'* (Aquila), two facts must be borne in mind; the one that Aquila represents a school of rabbinic exegesis, the other that the defective remains of the Hexapla[58] allow us to detect but a fraction of Jerome's indebtedness to him:[59]

1 9—כי לוית חן הם לראשך—*ut "addatur" gratia capiti tuo* = *α'*—*ὅτι "προσθήκη" χάριτός εἰσι τῇ κεφαλῇ σου*. There are several different roots לוה; one "twist," another "accompany." 𝔙 and *α'* derive לויה from the latter as against the usual exegesis.

6 10—מעט חִבֻּק ידים—*paululum conseres manus*. 𝔙 makes the construction personal, displacing the noun חִבֻּק by a verb; cp. *α'*—*περιλαμβάνεις*, 𝔖 וקליל "תסים" אידך על חדיך and 𝔗 קליל "תחבק" ידך (𝔊 *ὑπνοῖς*).

ואמרו לו יפיפית מבני אדם "Aquila, the proselyte, translated the Law before R. Eliezer and R. Joshua; they praised him and said unto him, 'thou art the fairest of men'." There is a play on יֶפֶת (from whom Aquila, according to Gen. 10 2, was descended) and יָפֶה (i. e., in יפיפית).

[55] Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1913, pp. XL—XLI, on the authority of *Com. on Is.* 8 14.

[56] At least until 553 A. D. See Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1914, p. 33.

[57] *Com. on Ezek.* 4 15 (Vall., V, 32). Cp. *Ep. 38, ad Damas.*, c. 12 (Vall., I, 167) and *Com. on Is.* 49 (Nowack, op. cit., p. 12).

[58] Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt*, Oxford, 1875.

[59] Whenever 𝔙 treats a difficult Hebrew word in Aquila's manner (i. e., by etymologizing it or otherwise being slavish to 𝔐), we may rightly suspect dependence on Aquila, provided that there is no evidence to the contrary.

7 20—ליום הכסא (cp. Ps. 81 4)—*in die plenae lunae* = α′—εἰς ἡμέραν πανσελήνου. Contrast 𝔊 δι' ἡμερῶν πολλῶν = 𝔖. The element of σελήνη or *luna* is present in Qimḥi: "the first of the month when the 'moon' is covered (יתכסה, i. e., connecting כסא with כסה)." Note Sa., "on the day of sacrifice." (AV. "the day appointed" goes back to Rashi לזמן המועד הקבוע. This is a good instance of rabbinic interpretation affecting Christian documents in the realm of O. T.)

8 14—תושיה[60]—*aequitas* = α′-εὐνομία.

b) *Symmachus*.—Jerome states that Symmachus was an Ebionite—one of a certain Jewish-Christian sect.[61] Geiger,[62] however, maintains that he was not only a Jew but perhaps none other than סומכוס בן יוסף,[63] the pupil of R. Meir. Of course, the objection to this is the default of recognition of Sym. in Jewish literature, as is accorded to Aquila and his translation. Geiger meets the situation by showing that the literalistic character of Aquila was acceptable to Jewry whereas the free, paraphrastic nature of Sym. was not. If Geiger failed to prove his point, he at least demonstrated that Sym. is replete with rabbinic exegesis.

Jerome lauds Sym. in no uncertain terms and admires his ingenious translation into good Greek but yet catching the sense of the Hebrew[64]—the very antithesis of slavish Aquila. This opinion is consistent with the fact that the Church Father adopts Sym. more than Aquila and Theodotion combined (at least in Proverbs). The following are the cases of 𝔙 depending on Sym. as far as can be discovered from the fragmentary remains of the latter:

---

[60] תושיה is problematic and is treated in 𝔙 thus: Pr. 18 1 tempus; Job 5 12 quod quis coepit; 6 13 necessarius; 11 16 and Pr. 3 21 lex; Job 12 16 sapientia; 26 3 prudentia; 30 22 valide; Pr. 2 7 and Mic. 6 9 salus; Pr. 8 14 aequitas; Is. 28 29 iustitia.

[61] Often, however, any Jewish-Christian was dubbed "Ebionite."

[62] *Jüd. Zeit. für Wiss. und Leben*, 1862, pp. 39—64; epitomized in the Hebrew Encyclopedia (אוצר ישראל), VII, 155.

[63] His knowledge of Greek has been inferred from Tal. Yer., Nazir, I, halaka 2. This passage is inconclusive because it merely informs us that סומכוס knew a few simple Greek words with which most Palestinians or Syrians must have been familiar.

[64] Examples are collected in Field, op. cit., p. XXXI.

4 8—סלסלה—*arripe illam*; cp. σ′ (i. e. Symmachus) *βάσταζε αὐτήν. βαστάζω* can mean (1) "lift up," (2) "carry off," or (3) "handle." The first definition is the usual translation of 𝔊, the second tallies with 𝔙, and the third equals the interpretation recorded in Rosh ha-Shana, 26b: "The rabbis did not know what סלסלה meant, until one day they overheard the maid of Judah the Prince's household saying to a man, who was handling (קמהפך) his hair, How long will you handle (מסלסל) your hair?[65]" 𝔙 doubtless follows Sym., which, in turn, may have been intended to represent סלסלה, either according to its natural sense, to wit, "lift up;" or according to the Talmudic definition of it, namely, "handle."

5 13—הוא ימות "באין" מוסר—*ipse morietur "quia" non habuit disciplinam*; cp. σ′—*διὰ ἀπαιδευσίαν*; Rashi: "בשביל" שלא לקח מוסר; and Qimḥi: "בעבור" שאין מקבל מוסר. באין means "without." The foregoing assert that the evil man dies "because" he would receive no instruction as against that he simply dies without it.

7 22—וכעכס—*et quasi agnus lasciviens*. "Agnus," which makes good parallelism with שור of the preceding stichos, may be due to Jerome reading כֶּבֶשׂ. Toy emends עכס to עגל.[40] "Lasciviens" has a curious counterpart in Sa. וכעאכס, which Derenbourg[26] translates "et comme un débauché" (Dozy[66] gives עכס as "to be debauched"). Saadia here falls back on his well known habit of

---

[65] לא הו ידעי רבנן מאי סלסלה ותרמכך יומא חד שמעוה לאמתא דבי רבי והוות אמרא לההוא גברא והוה קמהפך בשעריה אמרה ליה עד מתי אתה מסלסל בשערך.

The maid's words are Hebrew; the rest of the passage is Aramaic. The citation is evidence that Hebrew had not yet become extinct as a spoken language in Palestine. The holy tongue was used by all Judah's household including the maid, who is often mentioned in the Talmud (cp. Eliezer ben Yehuda, *Ad Ematai Dibberu 'Ibrit*, New York, 1919, p. 129). It is furthermore interesting to note that rabbis, as early as the second or third centuries A. D., cleared up difficulties of classical Hebrew by observing the contemporary colloquial survival of that language. We of today are prone to consider this method a contribution of modern philological research, but, as we see, it is nothing new.

[66] *Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes*, Leyden, 1881.

rendering a difficult Hebrew word by its Arabic homonym.[67] It is conceivable that Jerome knew the Arabic word from Lyddaeus,[68] his teacher who knew Arabic.[69] More likely, however, 𝔙 is here derived from Sym. *σκιρτῶν* "leaping, bounding." Both *lascivio* and *σκιρτάω* can mean "to frisk about." Sym. and 𝔙 agree against 𝔊 "like a dog" = 𝔖 = 𝔗.

13 4—מתאוה ואין נפשו[70] עצל—*vult et non vult piger* = σ′—*ἐπιθυμεῖ καὶ οὐ θέλει ὀκνηρός.*

15 12—לץ—*pestilens* = σ′—*λοιμός*. (On *λοιμός*, see Montgo-

---

[67] Malter, *Life and Works of Saadia Gaon*, Philadelphia, 1921, p. 145.

[68] In his *Preface to Job*, Jerome informs us that he paid a Lyddan preceptor, who was considered a first-class scholar among the Hebrews, no small sum for instruction in the holy tongue. Compare with this: "Audivi Lyddae quendam de Hebraeis, qui sapiens (= חכם) apud illos et *δευτερωτης* (= תנא) vocabatur, narrantem hujuscemodi fabulam (= midrash)" (*Com. on Hab.* 2 15, Rahmer, op. cit., pp. 8—9). However, Lyddaeus taught the Father primarily translation and interpretation and only occasionally midrashim, one of which Jerome thought ridiculous (Krauss, *Jewish Ency.*, VII, 116). Lyddaeus was, in the Saint's estimation, both fluent and useful. He translated Job into Greek and explained it in Latin for Jerome (*Jewish Ency.*, IV, 81; and VII, 116). The latter often contradicted him and stated that he merely read Bible with him (ibid., VII, 116). The little just summarized is all we can say about his Lyddan instructor. At least one contradiction is patent; viz., now the Church Father says that he studied translation and exegesis under him, and now that he simply read in his company. This suggests a plurality of Lyddans in the case. It so happened that Lydda and Tiberias were the only intellectual centers in Palestine at the time (Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Phila., 1891, II, 623) and hence his many Hebraei came from those towns.

[69] *Pref. to Job* (Stummer, op. cit., p. 246): "Haec autem translatio nullum de veteribus sequitur interpretem, sed ex ipso Hebraico, Arabicoque sermone et interdum Syro, nunc verba, nunc sensus, nunc simul utrumque resonabit." Rahmer (op. cit., p. 10), points that the foregoing does not indicate that Jerome knew Arabic and Syriac but that his Hebraeus did. Thus if 𝔙 *lasciviens* was suggested by the rabbi, we have a strange example of Jewish exegesis in 𝔙. This interpretation of עכם, in that event, may have been part of the lore of Arabic speaking Jewry down through Saadia's time.

[70] Perles (*Analekten zur Textkritik des alten Testaments*, Munich, 1895, p. 73) explains the ו of נפשו as a survival of an old case termination; cp. מעינו מים, חיתו ארץ or בנו פעור. EVV, "the *soul of the sluggard* desireth and hath nothing," anticipate Perles' suggestion.

mery, *Daniel*, International Critical Commentary, New York, 1927, p. 438.)

17 22—ייטב גהה—*aetatem floridam facit*; cp. σ′—*ἀγαθύνει ἡλικίαν.*

18 8—(דברי נרגן) כמתלהמים—*quasi simplicia* = σ′ (Syro-hexapla) איך תמ״מן. Cp. Saadia כאלמזאח "like a joke."

19 13—הות—*dolor* = σ′—*ὀδύνη.*

19 29—ומהלמות—*et mallei percutientes* = σ′—*σφυροκοπίαι.*

22 4—עקב (ענוה יראת יהוה)—*finis* = σ′—*ὕστερον* = Qimḥi—סוף. Cp. 𝔗 עקבא "consequence," MS. עקיבא "last" (see Jastrow, *A Dict. of the Targumim, etc.*, p. 1104). Qimḥi, who certainly did not copy Sym. or 𝔙, proves the Jewish nature of this interpretation. Though Jerome here probably follows Sym., there is always the possibility, in such a case, of direct dependence on a Hebraeus.

22 25—מוקש—*scandalum* = σ′—*σκάνδαλον.*

25 17—הקר—*subtrahe*; cp. σ′—*ὑπόστειλον.*

25 20—(מעדה־בגד ביום קרה[71]) חמץ על נתר ושר בשירים על לב־רע—*acetum in nitro qui cantat carmina cordi pessimo*; cp. σ′—*ὥσπερ ὄξος ἐπὶ νίτρῳ καὶ ᾄδων ἐν ᾄσμασιν ἐπὶ καρδίαν λυπηράν.*

25 23—(רוח צפון) תחולל גשם—*dissipat pluvias*; cp. σ′—*διαλύει βροχήν* (contrast "creates" or "brings forth"—so RV. and JV.). With σ′ and 𝔙 are Qimḥi (כלומר תמנע) and Taanit, 7b: "Rain is withheld only because of those who speak with an evil tongue, in accordance with Pr. 25 23."

c) *Theodotion.*—In a sense, Aquila's Version was a dictionary; Symmachus', a commentary; and Theodotion's, a translation. In a great measure, θ′ (Theodotion) is a revision of 𝔊; and, in many places both agree. Parts of θ′ have crept into MSS. of 𝔊, filling out lacunas[72] or as doublets. In the Church, the Theodotion of Daniel has so prevailed, that there exists but one MS. of 𝔊.[73]

---

[71] The first four words of this verse, which we have put in parentheses, are taken by 𝔙 as part of the preceeding verse. This yields excellent homophony and parallelism between בּוֹגֵד and בֶּגֶד and between ביום צרה and ביום קרה. This arrangement makes good sense in both verses involved.

[72] e. g., I Sam. 17 12—31 in Codex A.

[73] *Pref. to Com. on Daniel* (Buhl, *Canon and Text of O. T.*, p. 155): "Illud quoque lectorem admoneo, Danielem non juxta LXX interpretes sed juxta Theodotionem ecclesias legere, qui utique post adventum Christi incredulus

According to Irenaeus, Theodotion was a proselyte from Ephesus. Jerome, however, often calls him an Ebionite, but at other times writes that he was a Jew and that others call him an Ebionite.[74] Whatever Theodotion may have been, his knowledge of Hebrew came from Jews and hence he was exposed to Jewish tradition.

The following are the traceable borrowings of 𝔙 from Theodotion:

2 7—תושיה[60]—*salus* = θ′ — *σωτηρία.*

8 27—בחקו חוג על־פני תהום—*quando certe lege et gyro vallabat abyssos*; cp. θ′—*ἐν τῷ ἀκριβάζειν γῦρον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἀβύσσου.*

9 18—רפאים—*gigantes* = θ′ — *γίγαντες*, as against 𝔊 *γηγενεῖς*.

12 5—תחבלות—*concilia* = θ′ — *ἐννοήματα* against 𝔊 (which is followed by 𝔖 and 𝔗), which he generally follows in dealing with this Hebrew word (e. g., at 1 5).

15 16—(טוב־מעט ביראת יהוה) מאוצר רב ומהומה בו—*quam thesauri magni et "insatiabiles;"* cp. θ′ (Syro-Hexapla) יתיר מן סימתא רבתא ויענותא.

d)—Frequently Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion coincide. Below are the cases of such when followed by 𝔙:

21 28—ואיש שומע "לנצח" ידבר—*vir obediens loquetur "victoriam;"* cp. *α′σ′θ′ — εἰς "νῖκος" πορεύσεται.*

23 11—כי־גאלם—*propinquus (enim illorum)* = *α′σ′θ′ — ἀγχιστεύς.* גֹּאֵל is thus taken in its technical connotation as a term of Hebrew law (cp. Ruth 4 1—8, etc.).

26 15—בצלחת—*sub ascella sua* = *α′σ′θ′ —ἐν τῇ μάλῃ* and 𝔗 בשחתא "in the arm-pit" as against 𝔊 *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ* "in his bosom, lap" = 𝔖.

30 15—הון—*sufficit* = *α′σ′θ′* — *ἀρκεῖ* as against 𝔊 *ἱκανόν*, which in Latin would be "satis."

31 19—בכישור—*ad fortia* = *α′σ′θ′* — *ἀνδρείᾳ*. Cp. Mid. Mish., ad loc.: "... this refers to Jael who slew Sisera with no weapon other than a pin, by the *strength* of her hands." As Derenbourg suggests

---

fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Ebionitam, qui altero genere Judaeus." Cp. Montgomery, *Daniel*, pp. 24—26.

[74] Buhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 154 and 155.

(to explain Sa., ad loc.) כשרון may have been read. 𝔊 ἐπὶ τὰ συμφέροντα (= 𝔏 ad utilia) does not underlie 𝔙 here.

Sometimes 𝔙 goes with two of the Three (α′σ′θ′). The instances of 𝔙 following Aquila and Symmachus are:

6 13—מולל ברגלו—*terit pede.* מולל is most easily connected with "speak" (so AV.). In Neo-Hebrew, however, מלל can mean "crush, squeeze, rub" = "terit." 𝔙 is ably supported by a long and unbroken chain of Jewish exegesis; namely, α′—*τρίβων*, σ′—*προστρίβων*, 𝔖 ותכם ברגלה = 𝔗, Sa. ראכל ברגליה "kicking," and Rashi כלומר משפשף זה על זה "i. e., rubbing one upon the other."

13 13—הוא יְשֻׁלָּם—*in pace versabitur* = α′σ′ (and, incidentally, Quinta)—*εἰρηνεύει*. This interpretation reached Qimḥi: ישב בשלום "he will dwell in peace" and Ralbag: הוא לבדו יעמוד בשלום "he alone will stand in peace." The foregoing are quite distinct from the correct "shall be rewarded" (EVV.).

The cases of 𝔙 resembling Symmachus and Theodotion are:

21 15—ומחתה—*et pavor* = σ′θ′—*καὶ δειλία*. Apropos is Jerome's remark in Com. on Is. 58 3 (Nowack, op. cit.,[45] p. 12): "Melius Theodotio et Symmachus transtulerunt, quos nos in hoc loco secuti sumus."

26 10—ושכר כסיל ושכר עברים—*et qui imponit stulto silentium iras mitigat*; cp. θ′—*καὶ φιμῶν ἄφρονα φιμοῖ χόλους* and σ′—*καὶ ὁ φράσσων ἄφρονα ἐμφράσσει ὀργὰς αὐτοῦ.* That this is Jewish is borne out by Rashi, who, on the authority of a "midrash aggada," connects שכר with ויסכרו (Gen. 8 2), which means "shut."— Rashi does not specify the exact source of the above midrash. It must be remembered that the medieval, rabbinic commentators embody to a great extent, older material. While doing so (often subconsciously), they not infrequently omit mentioning their authorities.

IV. 𝔙 and its Relation to 𝔊[75] *with Reference to Jewish Interpretation*

In Jerome's day, the Septuagint and its daughter Version, the Itala, had gained currency in Western Christendom. Jerome's contribution to Biblical scholarship was the restoration of the Hebrew as the one great authority for the O. T.,[76] and, consequently, the relegation of 𝔊 to secondary importance.

---

[75] Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1895.

The Septuagint, as is well known, was made by Jews and hence is a witness of early and genuine Jewish tradition. The present essay, however, is concerned primarily with later rabbinic exegesis, which Jerome could have received from his Jewish teachers, rather than that embodied in 𝔊, in which every learned Christian was well versed. Yet, it must be borne in mind that tradition, particularly that of Biblical interpretation among the Jews, is tenacious. For this reason, 𝔊 often coincides with Talmudic and even medieval rabbinic interpretation (where borrowing from 𝔊 has certainly not taken place).[77] Therefore, when 𝔊, 𝔙, and Jewish tradition are at one, it is possible that Jerome arrived at his translation from the quarter of the Hebraei rather than from 𝔊. This possibility appears extremely probable, when we consider his critical position towards 𝔊[78] and his respect for the opinions of his Jewish masters in O. T. interpretation.[79] Bearing this in mind note the following passages where 𝔊, 𝔙 and rabbinic exegesis coincide:

2 7— וְצְפַּן לישרים תושיה[60]—𝔙 𝔏 *custodiet rectorum salutem* = 𝔊 *καὶ θησαυρίζει τοῖς κατορθοῦσι σωτηρίαν*. Cp. Deut. Rab., 140a, which tells where to find safety (= *salus*) or assylum: "... flee to

---

[76] Thus refers he to 𝔥 as *Hebraica Veritas* (*passim*). Cp. *Com. on Est.* 10 3—4: "Quae habentur in hebraeo, plena fide expressi" (Stummer, op. cit., p. 98).

[77] Aptowitzer, *Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata*, I: *Die Bücher Samuelis*, *ZAW*, 1909, pp. 241—252.

[78] e. g., apropos of the Septuagint of Daniel, he remarks in his *Pref. to Dan.*: "--hoc unum affirmare possum, quod multum a veritate (i. e. 𝔥) discordet et recto iudicio repudiatus sit." Cp. what he writes, in *Pref. to Ps.* (Nowack, op. cit., p. 12), against the defenders of 𝔊 and 𝔏: "Perversissimi homines; nam cum semper novas exspectant voluptates et gulae eorum vicina maria non sufficiant, cur in solo studio Scripturarum veteri sapore contenti sunt."

[79] e. g., he applies to the Hebraei's mastery of Hebrew the proverb: "peritis in arte sua credendum est" (Condamin, op. cit., p. 3). Or again: "Sicubi in translatione tibi videor errare, interroga Hebraeos, diversarum urbium magistros consule" (ibid., p. 2).

the Torah! There is no hiding-place other than Torah, as it is written in Pr. 2 7." 𝔙, 𝔏, 𝔊 and this midrash doubtless go back to the same Jewish interpretation of תושיה in this passage.

4 2—לֶקַח—*donum* = 𝔊 δῶρον,—taking לקח concretely (contrast EVV. "doctrine"). The following are some of the many rabbinic authorities that likewise imply a concrete meaning of לקח here. (1) Abot 3 18 describes לקח as "... a precious article (presented to Israel by God) by which the universe was created, in accordance with Pr. 4 2."[80] (2) Berakot, 5a: "Observe that God is unlike man. In a transaction between men, the seller is sad and the buyer joyous; but God gave Israel the Torah (i. e., לֶקַח) and rejoiced."[81] (3) Yalkut, ad loc.: "One carrying merchandise on the road, fears robbers; but not so with the Torah which thieves cannot take from one's heart. Hence Torah is a good gift (לקח)."[82] (4) Ralbag takes the trouble to define לקח as קנין. Note, especially in the first two rabbinic parallels, that לקח refers to a gift = *donum*. 𝔊 and 𝔙 here reveal the exegesis of Israel's teachers.

12 27—לא־יחרך—*non inveniet* = 𝔊 οὐκ ἐπιτεύξεται = 𝔖 𝔗 לא נסתקבל = Sa. לא יצאדף.[83] (This interpretation defies philological justification. BDB.[84] explain חרך as "set in motion," on the analogy of the Arabic חַרַךְ "move" or as "roast" on the basis of the Aramaic חֲרַךְ. Gen. Rab., 79a, cites a rabbinic curiosity, according to which יחרך is a conflation of יאחר and יאריך).

---

[80] חביבים ישראל שנתן להם כלי חמדה חבה יתרה נודעת להם שנתן להם כלי חמדה שבו נברא העולם שנאמר כי לקח טוב וגו'.

[81] בוא וראה שלא כמדת הקב"ה מדת בשר ודם מדת בשר ודם מוכר חפץ לחברו מוכר עצב ולוקח שמח אבל הקב"ה אינו כן נתן להם תורה לישראל ושמח שנאמר כי לקח וגו'.

[82] ד"א מי שלוקח סחורה ויוצא לדרך מתירא מן הלסטין אבל התורה אינה כן שמא יכולים הלסטים ליקח תורתו מתוך לבו הוי לקח טוב.

[83] When the VSS and later Jewish exegesis agree in the book of Proverbs, as is the case here, we may suspect the following process: Taking 𝔊 as the starting point, the later VSS and 𝔙 and 𝔖 may copy it. The Targum of Proverbs, in turn, being a sub-Version of 𝔖, frequently reproduces 𝔖, and hence the given interpretation in 𝔊 thus eventually comes to the notice of Jewish expositors, who are at liberty to repeat it.

[84] Brown, Driver and Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Boston and New York, 1907, p. 355.

13 6—ורשעה תסלף חטאת—*impietas autem "peccatorem" supplantat,* i. e. reading חטאת כמו חוטא (Rashi) = MS. "A" of 𝔊: *τους δε ασεβεις φαυλους ποιει αμαρτια* "sin brings 'the wicked' to naught" and 𝔖 ולחטיא תובדיוהי חטיתא. Qimḥi, too, defines חטאת as איש חטאת.

13 11—הון מהבל ימעט—*substantia "festinata" minuetur* = 𝔊 *ὕπαρξις ἐπισπουδαζομένη (μετὰ ἀνομίας) ἐλάσσων γίνεται*; i. e., reading מְבֹהָל for מֵהֶבֶל. In Erubin, 54 b, this passage is explained as meaning: "If one studies bundlewise (חבילות חבילות, i. e., too many subject at one time), his learning will decrease; whereas, if one obtains his knowledge gradually, it will increase."[85] It is conceivable (but the point cannot be pressed) that 𝔙 and 𝔊 read the ה in מהבל as ח, just as the rabbis associate מהבל with חבילות. (In 𝔙, often ה is confused with ח, as well as ו with י and ד with ר; as Nowack, op. cit.,[45] p. 23, points out. This shows, incidentally, that Jerome read a Hebrew text in square characters.)

17 2—בבן־מביש—*filiis "stultis"*; cp. 𝔊 *δεσποτῶν "ἀφρόνων"*. Interpreting מביש as "foolish" survives among the medieval rabbis; e. g., Qimḥi equates it with כסיל, while Ralbag with "עצל וסכל."

18 1—(לתאוה יבקש נפרד) בכל־תושיה[60] יתגלע—*omni tempore erit exprobrabilis* = 𝔊 *ἐν παντὶ δὲ καιρῷ ἐπονείδιστος ἔσται.* Cp. Horayot, 10 b: "The separated one who seeks pretexts is Lot, who parted from Abraham. בכל תושיה יתגלע means that *his disgrace is disclosed* (נתגלה with ה) in the synagogues and academies, as we have learned that the Ammonite and the Moabite are restricted (from entering therein) forever (cp. *omni tempore*)."[86] Note the similarity of "his disgrace is disclosed" and "erit exprobrabilis."

18 22—(מצא) אשה (מצא טוב)—*mulierem "bonam"* = 𝔊 *γυναῖκα ἀγαθήν* = 𝔖 אתתא טׄבתא = 𝔗. The rabbis also add "good" in

[85] אמר רב סחורה אמר רב הונא מאי דכתיב הון מהבל ימעט וקובץ על יד ירבה אם עושה אדם תורתו חבילות חבילות מתמעט ואם לאו קובץ על יד ירבה.

[86] דרש רבא ואיתמא רבי יצחק מאי דכתיב לתאוה יבקש נפרד ובכל תושיה יתגלע לתאוה יבקש נפרד זה לוט שנפרד מאברהם בכל תושיה יתגלע שנתגלה קלונו בבתי כניסיות ובבתי מדרשות דתנן עמוני ומואבי אסורין אסור עולם.

order to safeguard the interpretation of the passage; e. g., see Berakot, 8a; Yebamot, 63b; Shoḥer Ṭob,[87] 151a and b.

18 24—איש רעים להתרועע —*vir amabilis ad societatem* = Septuagint column of Hexapla, *sub asterisco*,[88] ἀνὴρ ἑταίρων πρὸς ἑταιρίαν; cp. 𝔖 אית רֹחמא דרחמא אנון and 𝔗 אית חברי דמתחברין. Qimḥi, following 𝔗, equates התרועע with התחבר. Rashi: "Unto a man who makes friends will come a day when he will need them."[89] Note that all the above connect התרועע with רֵעַ "friend" and not with רַע "evil," as does RV.: "He that maketh friends doeth it to his own destruction," and similarly JV.

20 3—יתגלע—"*miscentur*" *contumeliis*; cp. 𝔊 συμπλέκεται. The idea of entanglement is also present in Qimḥi: יתגלה יתערב במריבה "he becomes mixed up in strife," and in Ralbag: אף כל אויל יתבלבל ויתערב בריב. Cp. above on 18 1 (p. 407). Note also 17 4 התגלע—*pati contumeliam*, reading התגלה (for Jerome's interchanging אהח"ע, see Nowack, op. cit.,[45] p. 6). Nowack, p. 7, states that the Church Father's renderings of such Hebrew words show uncertainty. The above parallels disclose the likelihood of rabbinic influence at work.

22 20—שָׁלְשׁוֹם (i. e., Ktib שָׁלְשׁוֹם and Qre שָׁלִישִׁים)—𝔙 𝔏 *tripliciter* = 𝔊 τρισσῶς; cp. 𝔖 על תלֿת זבנ̈ין = 𝔗. The Ktib is elsewhere found only as part of the idiom (א)תמול שלשום "formerly," lit. "yesterday and the day before." The Qre means "chiefs, officers." If it represent a numeral, שְׁלֹשִׁים "thirty"[90] is closest to it and not "three" or "triply,"[91] as the VSS. have it. However,

---

[87] Buber, *Midrasch Tehillim* (or *Schocher Tob*), Wilna, 1891.

[88] i. e., supplied by Origen to fill a lacuna in 𝔊 in order to make 𝔊 square with 𝔥. Since Jerome wrote in Palestine, he probably used the Palestinian (i. e. Origenic) recension of 𝔊: "Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem; Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. *Mediae inter has provinciae Palestinos codices legunt*, quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius atque Pamphilus vulgaverunt" (*Pref. to Chron.*; Stummer, op. cit., p. 239).

[89] אדם שקונה לו רעים עוד יבוא יום שיצטרך להם.

[90] The *thirty* Egyptian proverbs of Amenemope have been neatly connected with this section, thus favoring our reading שְׁלשִׁים. See Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament*, London, 1927, p. 63ff.

[91] If this tradition be right, we may keep the Ktib, שְׁלְשׁוֹם, and consider it

rabbinic exegesis is in harmony with the VSS. In Megilla, 7a, (anent the opposition against canonizing Esther) it is related that Esther sent a message to the sages saying: "Inscribe me unto the generations." They replied, quoting Pr. 22 20: "Lo I have written for thee שלישים and not רבעים ..."[92]. Rashi (ad loc., in Talmud) explains this as referring to the war of Amalek, which is mentioned *thrice*; to wit, in Ex. 17, Dt. 25 and I Sam. 16. Another corroboration, even more interesting by dint of its being on the authority of Ḥama bar Ḥanina (possibly Jerome's Baranina, see p. 388), is present in Lam. Rab., 99b (on Lam. 3 1): The words which Jeremiah wrote "such as these" (cp. Jer. 36 32) are the *three* occurences of the word איכה in Lamentations (which book tradition ascribes to the pen of Jeremiah), as is implied by Pr. 22 20, construing שלישים as "משולשים" דברים.—Rashi expounds שָׁלְשׁוֹם as the "threefold" canon; viz., the Law, Prophets and Hagiographa. Mid. Mish. illustrates this verse with a prolix catalogue of "triads.[93]" It would be easy to augment the number of rabbinic references supporting the interpretation of שלשום as "triply." We cannot, in such a case, dogmatically assert that 𝔙 copies 𝔊 or 𝔗 and without more ado, dispense with the role of the Hebraei such as Baranina.

26 28—דכיו—*veritatem* = 𝔊 ἀλήθειαν = 𝔖 קושתא; cp. 𝔗 ארחתא דקושטא "the way of truth." This interpretation may be due to confusion with the Aramaic דכיא or דכי "clear, pure."

28 7—ורעה זוללים—*qui autem comessatores "pascit;"* cp. 𝔊 ὃς δὲ "*ποιμαίνει*" *ἀσωτίαν* and *α′θ′* — *καὶ νέμ(ων) συμβολοκόπους.*

29 3—ורעה זונות—*qui autem "nutrit" scorta* = 𝔊 ὃς δὲ *ποιμαίνει*

---

a Semitic adverbial accusative of שָׁלוֹשׁ ending in וֹם (cp. פִּתְאֹם, etc.), which, accordingly would mean "triply." True it is that this would be a hapax legomenon; but, examples of such are nothing unusual in the book of Proverbs.

[92] שלחה להם אסתר להם לחכמים כתבוני לדורות שלחו לה הלא כתבתי לך שלישים ולא רבעים עד שמצאו לו מקרא כתוב בתורא כתב זאת זכרון בספר כתב זאת מה שכתוב כאן ובמשנה תורה זכרון מה שכתוב בנביאים בספר מה שכתוב במגלה.

[93] אמר ר׳ ישמעאל כל מעשה תורה משולש תורה נביאים וכתובים אותיותיה משולשים אל"ף מ"ם תי"ו אמ"ת ושבט משולש ראובן שמעון לוי ואותיות משולשים לוי וגו׳.

πόρνας or α′ — *νέμων πόρνας*; cp. 𝔖 ודרעא בזניותא. Qimḥi suggests מפרנס הזונות (= 𝔙).

30 31—זרזיר—*gallus* = 𝔊 α′θ′ — *ἀλέκτωρ* = 𝔖 אבכא "fighter, great cock" = 𝔗 אבכא or תרנגולי "cock." The opinions of scholars differ regarding this hapax legomenon. In favor of the VSS. are Syr. זרזירא and Arabic זֻרְזֻר "starling," which afford partial support for VSS. "cock."

31 21—שָׁנִים—*duplicibus*; cp. 𝔊 *δισσὰς χλαίνας* and α′θ′ (Syro-Hexapla)—תשוֿיתא תרֿיניתא. The foregoing associate שָׁנִים with the numeral שְׁנַיִם; cp. Tanḥuma, II, 109a, where the passage is said to refer to the many "pairs" connected with the Bible and Judaism.[94] Also note Rashi (in מקראי קדש, Warsaw, 1887) ד״א מלובשים בכפל "clad doubly."

31 29—עשו חיל—*congregaverunt* "*divitias*" = 𝔊 *ἐκτήσαντο πλοῦτον* = 𝔖 קנֿי עותרא = 𝔗; cp. Sanhedrin, 20a: זה יוסף ובועז (N.B.: Joseph and Boaz are two classical examples of O. T. plutocrats.) All the above render חיל as "wealth."

V. 𝔙 and Rabbinic Exegesis in Dealing with Textual and Philological Problems

Etymology, word-division, vocalization, Qre and Ktib, etc. are vital parts of O. T. exegesis; for, it is just these that control interpretation. The Massoretic apparatus has attempted to settle most of these matters, but Jerome lived and wrote when this great work was still in the making and in oral form. Therefore, if the Father anticipates the dicta of the Massora in passages capable of various interpretations, the influence of Baranina, Chaldaeus, Lyddaeus or another of his Jewish instructors may very likely be at work. In view of Jerome's own testimony; to wit, that he follows the rabbinic interpretation of the Hebraica Veritas (e. g., "Sicubi ergo editio mea a veteribus discrepat, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum," *Adv. Ruf. II*, Rahmer, *op. cit.*, p. 15), it is not surprising that 𝔙 actually *is* closer to 𝔐, or the textus receptus, than any other ancient Version (Nowack, *op. cit.*, p. 55; Stummer, op. cit., pp. 123

---

[94] ת״ל כי כל ביתה לבוש שנים. שנים שנים מילה פריעה. ציצית תפילין. הענק תעניק. נתן תתן. פתח תפתח. עשר תעשר. וגו׳.

to 124). This fact alone is sufficient evidence to establish the great dependence of the Church Father on his teachers, the Hebraei. Below, however, we note some of the passages where 𝔙 represents Jewish, but non-Massoretic interpretation. It is obvious that the rabbis often differed with one another. A familiar example is the mutual opposition that existed between the school of Hillel and that of Shammai. The Massoretes, in dealing with a given verse or word, had to accept one and only one reading, even though several others, in addition, had been held by Jewish expositors. With this understanding of non-Massoretic rabbinic exegesis, we may proceed:

Instead of transliterating proper names, Jerome frequently translates them according to their derivations (cp. Stummer, op. cit., p. 113); thus at 30 1—דברי אגור בן־יקה—*Verba Congregantis filii Vomentis* = Jewish interpretation: e. g., Rashi, Qimḥi, Ralbag, Ex. Tanḥuma 73a. As a typical example, we cite Ex. Rab., 138b: דברי אגור בן יקא. שאיגר דברי תורה והקיאן "the words of him who assembled the words of the Law and vomited them forth."

In 31 2, בר occurs thrice and is generally translated as an Aramaism meaning "son." Jerome ascribes a Hebrew etymology to it and translates מה־ברי *quid dilecte mi*, deriving it from ברר "purify, *select*" (BDB.). Cp. Lev. Rab., 19a: "R. Hosea declared that מה בני is not written here but instead מה ברי; and, accordingly, the reference is to the commandments and admonitions of the Law, which is called pure (בר)."[95] Sanhedrin, 70b, however, fuses this midrashic interpretation with the Aramaic explanation: „May I have an industrious son (= Aramaic בר), well rounded in the Law and worthy of prophecy."[96]

Occasionally, by dividing a word in two, the Church Father arrives at an interesting translation:

(1)—30 1—לאיתיאל—*(vir) cum quo est Deus* "אמר שלמה "אתי אל

---

[95] מה ברי ומה בר בטני א"ר הושעיה מה בני אכ"כ אלא מה ברי אלו צואות ואזהרות של תורה שנקראת בר כד"א (תהלים ב) נשקו בר שכל דבריה ברים.

[96] ואמרתי יהא לי בן זריז וממולא בתורה והגון לנביאות.

(Zohar,[97] I, 76a) = "איתי אל" שהיה אמר (Ex. Tanḥuma, 73a). The foregoing split the proper name איתיאל into אִתִּי אֵל.

(2)—30 31—ומלך אלקום עמו—*nec est rex qui resistat*[98] *ei* (reading אל־קום). This word-division is implied in Rosh ha-Shana, 14b, and in the commentary עץ יוסף on Lam. Rab., 106a. Particularly interesting is Sa. וכדאך אלמלך לא קואם מעה "et de même le roi, il ne faut pas lui résister." The Eastern Massora has אַל־קוּם (two words).

Jerome's ℌ differed from 𝔐 not only in regard to word-division but even regarding the consonants themselves. Thus at 21 6—מבקשי־מות—𝔙 𝔏 *laqueos mortis* = 𝔊 *παγίδας θανάτου*. The casual observer might conclude that 𝔙 is here unfaithful to the "Hebraica Veritas" in favor of 𝔊 𝔏. However, Rashi states that he had before him מוקשי מות, which is what 𝔊, 𝔏 and 𝔙 read. Another instance of 𝔙 representing a copy of ℌ, diverging as to consonants from the textus receptus, is at 12 28—דרך נתיבה—*iter autem devium*; cp. 𝔊 *ὁδοὶ δὲ μνησικάκων*, 𝔖 וארחא דאכ̈תנא "the way of the venemous" or "vindicative," and 𝔗 ואורח דעותנא (Lag. ואורח דאבתנא). Perles (*Analekten zur Textkritik d. A. T.*, 1895, p. 87) ingeniously supposes נִתְעָב, or more accurately the plural נִתְעָבִים, to underlie 𝔊. We may adopt this suggestion as a possible explanation of 𝔙. This reading forces אַל־מות, of the following stichos, to be taken as אֶל־מות by 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗, as do also several extant Hebrew MSS.[99]

The Saint's MS. of ℌ, though unvocalized, had *matres lectionis* or vowel letters (which he calls *vocales*!), as is obvious from his *Com. on Is.* 38 15 (Vall., IV, 473): "Media enim vocalis litera *vau* si ponatur inter duas *samach*, legitur *sus* et appellatur *equus*; si *jod* legitur *sis*, et *hirundo* dicitur." At 23 10, 𝔙 implies a non-Massoretic, but withal a rabbinic mater lectionis: עוֹלָם (אל־תסג גבול)—*parvulorum* (reading עוּלִים; cp. Is. 49 15 and 65 20). The Mishna,[100] Peah, 5 6 and 7 3, cites this word as עולים. The yod is incompatible with the Massoretic vocalization. Jer. Tal.,[101] Peah 5 6, p. 27 b, would point the Mishna עוֹלִים; referring, according to R. Jeremiah, to עוֹלֵי מצרים "those who went up from Egypt;" or, as R. Joseph would have it, to אלו שירדו מנכסיהן לסמיא צווחין סגיא נהורא "those who 'went down' from (i. e., who lost) their wealth,—an ironical expression like calling a blind man 'great of light'." In Sifra,[102] the same stichos is quoted as לא תשיג גבול עולים, but the context shows that the citation is from the Mishna, loc. cit., and hence constitutes no additional evidence.—In passing, note that the Hebrew Encyclopedia (אוצר ישראל), VII, p. 155, states that Symmachus reads עולים. Field,[58] however, records no such reading.

---

[97] *Zohar*, Wilna, 1911.

[98] For קום with עם in the sense of *resistere*, see Ps. 94 16.

[99] For variant readings of the Hebrew, see Ginsburg, *The Old Testament*, London, 1926; and Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, Leipzig, I, 1905, II 1906. We should bear in mind that when 𝔙 does not square with 𝔐, Jerome, nevertheless, may well be following a Hebrew MS, which differs from our textus receptus. We must further be on our guard against attributing inner Vulgate corruptions to Jerome. The critical edition of 𝔙, now being prepared by the Catholic Church, will emend many errors that arose in the copying and recopying of the Vulgate.

Jerome used an unvocalized copy of 𝔥, and so at times assumes vowels differing from those now found in 𝔐.[103] Below are selected cases of 𝔙 implying rabbinic but non-Massoretic vowels:

12 9— טוב נקלה וְעֶבֶד לו—*melior est pauper et sufficiens sibi*; cp. 𝔊 *κρείσσων ἀνὴρ ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ δουλεύων ἑαυτῷ* and 𝔖 טב הו גברא מסכנא דמשמש נפשה. All the foregoing read וְעֹבֵד, as noted by Nowack (*op. cit.*, p. 53).

12 16—יִוָּדַע כעסו—*indicat iram suam* = 𝔊 *ἐξαγγέλει ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ* and σ′ — *δηλώσει θυμὸν αὐτοῦ*, all reading יוֹדִעַ.

12 19—וְעֵד־ארגיעה—*qui autem testis est repentinus* = 𝔊 *μάρτυς δὲ ταχύς* = 𝔖 וסהדא מסרהבא, all reading וְעֵד. Cp. Is. 30 8 where VSS. read לְעֵד for 𝔐 לָעַד.

14 18—וערומים יַכְתִּרוּ דעת—*et expectabunt astuti scientiam* = α′ —

---

[100] Choreb edition, New York and Berlin, 1923—1924.

[101] *Talmud Yerushalmi*, Wilna, 1922.

[102] Isaac Hirsch Weiss, *Sifra*, Vienna, 1862, p. 88a: המניח כלכלה תחת הגפן בשעה שהוא בוצר הרי זה גוזל את העניים על זה נאמר לא תשיג גבול עולים.

[103] Even the literalist, Aquila, deviates from 𝔐; cp. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila*, Philadelphia, 1916, pp. 85ff.

ἀναμενοῦσι γνῶσιν = Ralbag החכמים ימתנו שימצאו הדעת "the wise wait to find knowledge." All presuppose יְכַתְּרוּ (cp. Job 36 2; note also כַּתַּר, which has this sense in common Syriac usage). 𝔐 יַכְתִּרוּ is properly "they will crown, surround" while יְכַתְּרוּ is "they will wait for, expect." 𝔙 follows a non-Massoretic interpretation, to which Jewish exegetes resorted during a period at least as long as that between Aquila and Ralbag.

21 14—יִכְפֶּה—*extinguit* = σ′ — *σβέσει*, reading יְכַבֶּה as also 𝔗 מדעכא.

24 15—רָשָׁע—*impietatem* = σ′ — *ἀσέβειαν*, reading רֶשַׁע.

27 17—ברזל בברזל יָ֑חַד ואיש יַחַד פני־רעהו—*ferrum ferro exacuitur, et homo exacuit faciem amici sui*; i. e., taking יחד (bis) verbally as do 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗[104] also. 𝔙 and 𝔗 read, in the first case, יָ֑חַד; whereas 𝔊 and 𝔖, יָחֵד.[105] The prepositional prefix of בברזל favors 𝔙 and 𝔗. All VSS. read יָחֵד[105] in the second stichos. Ḥama bar Ḥanina, thought to be Baranina, Jerome's Hebrew teacher (p. 388), interestingly enough interprets this verse like 𝔙: "A knife can be sharpened only by the side of another knife; so too a scholar can be sharpened only by a fellow scholar" [106] (Gen. Rab., 82a).

𝔙 (at least in Proverbs) generally goes with the Qre against the Ktib; e. g., at 20 20 (against 𝔊, but with 𝔗 and Saadia), 20 21 (with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 σ′θ′ and the rabbinic commentators),[107] 23 26, and 26 2 (against VSS. but with Zohar, I, 175a). However at 20 4, 𝔙 = Ktib; and in a single verse, to wit 6 13, 𝔙 runs now with the Qre and now with the Ktib. The passages where Jerome departs from the older VSS. in adopting the Qre, are evidence of the Father adopting rabbinic exegesis; for, the Qre is merely one of the ways in which the rabbis came to express Bible interpretation.

---

[104] 𝔊 *σίδηρος σίδηρον ὀξύνει ἀνὴρ δὲ παροξύνει πρόσωπον ἑταίρου.* 𝔖 פרזלא בפרזלא לטיש וגברא לטש פרצופא דחברה. 𝔗 פרזלא לפרזלא לטש וגברא לטש אפיה דחבריה.

[105] Or יַחֵד. 𝔐, but for the accent, could be this form with improper pataḥ for ṣere in a closed syllable.

[106] ר' חמא ב"ח פתח ברזל בברזל יחד א"ר חמא בר חנינא אין סכין מתחדדת אלא בירך של חבירתה כך אין ת"ח מתחדד אלא בחבירו. ברזל בב' וגו'.

[107] The Jews regard the Qre alone as authentic.

Conclusion.—On the foregoing pages, the reader has observed a classified list of parallels between the Vulgate of Proverbs and rabbinic exegesis. Although the evidence, on the whole, is of a cumulative character, we have noted some absolutely certain cases of Jerome borrowing directly from his Jewish masters. Thus, it has been demonstrated that if the Church Father were asked how he came to translate אמון, at 8 30, *cuncta componens*,[108] he would have replied: "Hebraeus, qui me in Scripturis erudivit, ita legi posse asseruit." Also it has been proved that St. Jerome's rendering of מרגמה as *acervus Mercurii*, came from one of his Hebraei, possibly from Baranina himself!

Because Jerome incorporated much of the older Versions into the Vulgate, and because all the Versions represent Jewish tradition to some extent, some Jewish exegesis has reached the Vulgate through the Versions. However, we have noted that when the Vulgate, the older Versions and rabbinic exegesis agree, it is often probable that the Father is following instruction, which was personally imparted to him by his Jewish teachers (e. g., Baranina; see on 22 20, on 27 17).

The numerous examples of Jerome pronouncing the same exegesis as latter rabbis (against the Versions), prove the antiquity of midrashim, that would otherwise be considered late (cp. on 3 27). Graetz long ago showed that studying the Church Fathers is prerequisite to putting the Haggada in its proper perspective: "Wir werden nämlich sehr oft auf Sentenzen stoßen, die man auf den ersten Blick als subjective Einfälle einer jüngern Autorität halten möchte, die aber doch bereits bei ältern Kirchenvätern in ausgeprägter Gestalt vorkommen" (*op. cit.*, p. 311).

---

[108] The fact that there is a shade of difference between *cuncta componens* and (רבתא see note 25) does not militate against our theory that Jerome follows a Hebraeus. Indeed, sometimes the Father jumbles up the midrashim, that the rabbis told him. A convincing instance of this is present at II Sam. 23, 8, where, in הוא עדינו העצנו ט is rendered *ipse est quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus.* Cp. Mo'ed Qaton, 16b: "When he sat and busied himself with the Torah, he made himself pliant like the worm; but when he went out to battle, he hardened himself like wood." Aptowitzer, *op. cit., p.* 252, properly remarks: "Hieronymus hat diese Agada entweder umgedeutet oder mißverstanden, beides bei ihm nicht selten."

This essay adds a grain or two of substantiation to the thesis of Krauss (which Condamin emphatically denies, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 and 20); to wit, that "Jerome's exegesis is Jewish in spirit, reflecting the methods of the Palestinian haggadists" (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, p. 117).

MIDRASH IN THE PROPHETS

ROBERT GORDIS
NEW YORK CITY

I. Until quite recently, all students of Hebrew literature assumed a wide and impassable chasm between the Bible and the literary products of post-canonical Judaism. For reasons that need not concern us here, the Bible was looked upon as the culminating point in the spiritual history of Israel; all that came after was an inferior sequel. Vivid and forceful contrasts were drawn between the noble, free-flowing spirit of the Prophets and the confined, petty legalism of the Rabbis; between the great poetry of Israel's Golden Age and the unadorned prose or artificial poetry of later periods; between the classic purity of the language of the Bible and its degenerate offspring, that graceless, hybrid idiom known as Rabbinic Hebrew.

This attitude is now rapidly being out-moded. Deeper researches have laid bare the intimate and organic connection between "Hebraism" and "Judaism." We are now becoming increasingly aware that the same spirit animates both and that the difference are to be accounted for as the normal variations in the life-history of any organism. The germ of much that is characteristically "Rabbinic" is to be sought in the Bible. Conversely, the entire course and development of Biblical ideals and institutions must be studied in the Mishnic and post-Mishnic periods.

In this paper we seek to establish one more bond of union between Hebraism and normative Judaism. We hope to prove the existence of that most characteristic genre of the Rabbis—the

Midrash—in Biblical times and its utilization by the Prophets. From such a study we hope to gain more than merely a truer exegesis of several passages, important as that is. There will emerge another aspect of the spirit and literary structure of Prophecy, as well as a recognition of the essential truth of the Talmudic dictum that makes Prophet and Scribe two links in the same, unbroken chain of tradition.

II. The Midrashic form may be analyzed into two elements, one—legend—common to all peoples, the other, restricted almost entirely to Jewish literature. Legend is the result of two complementary impulses, a poetical and narrative fancy innate in man, and an equally fundamental curiosity. Primitive man seeks to account for his environment, the sun, the moon, the rainbow, and the storm, by producing nature myths. His interest in the traditions of his race leads him to fill in the many gaps in his knowledge, in the same manner. The stories of young Abraham in Terah's idol-shop, or Alfred the Great in the old woman's hut, or George Washington and the cherry-tree, bear witness to the wide prevalence of the "personality" legend.

Legend is, as we have said, common to all nations. In the case of the Jewish people, however, it was usually subjected to a reworking before it became a typical Midrash. When the folk-tale is linked up to a *Biblical verse* in some *homiletic* fashion and a *moral lesson* is drawn for the edification of the audience, we have a full-fledged Midrash. We may call the first the expansion-element; the second, the interpretation-element. It must be added that this analysis is not always applicable. In many instances, only the first element exists; this may be called the "incomplete" as against the "complete" type of Midrash.

III. The propensity to Midrash in the Old Testament has not been altogether unnoticed, especially in the case of the Book of Chronicles. If we except certain auxiliary sources which the Chronicler may have used,[1] the book may aptly be called a Midrash to Kings. The expansion-element is evident in the large amount of additional information supplied regarding the lives of the Davidic kings, the institution of the Levitical choruses, and the Temple functionaries. Scarcely less apparent is the interpretation-element. The central purpose of the Chronicler is the glorification of the Temple worship and its protectors, the kings of Judah, and to this aim the entire history is subservient.

---

[1] Cf. Driver: *Intr. to Literature* of O. T., 12 ed. pp. 527—533.

The Midrashic character of Chronicles has been recognized by scholars for decades. Yet the existence of Midrashim in pre-exilic Israel and its use by the Prophets have been altogether overlooked.

IV. The difficult twelfth chapter of Hosea is a case in point. To follow the connection and meaning in all the details is almost impossible.[2] Yet the drift of the passage is unmistakable. The prophecy is a comparison between the life of Jacob and that of his descendants, and an attempt to trace their propensities to sin and wickedness in the life-history of their ancestor.[3] The Pentateuchal story of Jacob's life, while not necessarily laudatory, is far from being unfavorable to the Patriarch. In its familiar version, it could not serve Hosea's purpose. Boldly disregarding the conventional form, the prophet interprets it in a new and unfamiliar light, so as to bring home a moral lesson to his audience—the exact procedure of the Darshan (homilectic preacher) to-day.

The first fragment of the Midrash meets us in v. 4:

בבטן עקב את אחיו   ובאונו שרה את האלהים

That Hosea here implies a reproach is plain by the preceding verse: וריב לד׳ עם יהודה לפקד על יעקב כדרכיו, as well as by his use of the verb עקב, which, in the two other passages where it occurs (Gen. 27 36; Jer. 9 3), always means "attack insidiously, overreach." In Genesis 25 26, Jacob's seizing of Esau's heel is described non-committally as וְיָדוֹ אֹחֶזֶת בַּעֲקֵב אָחִיו, Hosea, however, uses the verb עקב with its sinister implications, the same word used by Esau in his wrath (Gen. 27 36) ויעקבני זה פעמים. The verse ought therefore to be rendered:

---

[2] Cf. Harper's commentary in the *ICC* series, ad loc.

[3] Cf. Harper p. 379: "Jacob's supplanting of his brother in the womb before birth indicates that fatal characteristic of the nation, which, as exhibited again and again in its history, has now reached the point at which punishment must be administered. This reference clearly carries with it reproach."

In the womb he overreached his brother, and in his prime[4] *he contended with God.*

Here we have the very essence of Midrash - what we have called the interpretation-element. In the verse following, we find the other characteristic of Midrash, the expansion-element:

v. 5 וישר אל מלאך ויכל   בכה ויתחנן לו
בית אל ימצאנו   ושם ידבר עמנו

He strove with an angel and prevailed; he wept and made supplication to him;
At Bethel he would find him; and there he would speak with him.

In Genesis we are told that the angel asked: שלחני כי עלה השחר (32 27). We find no mention of his weeping or of any promise to meet Jacob at Bethel. These details are noteworthy examples of the expansion-element in its purity. The exact connection of the verses here becomes confused,[5] but we meet with another strand of the Jacob Midrash in v. 13:

ויברח יעקב שדה ארם ויעבד ישראל באשה ובאשה שמר.

And Jacob fled to the field of Aram, and Israel served for a wife and for a wife he guarded (the flocks).

Here Jacob's serving Laban for Rachel, while not inherently sinful, is contrasted with the Lord's far more exalted action in taking Israel out of Egypt under the guidance of His prophet; ובנביא העלה ה׳ את ישראל ממצרים ובנביא נשמר. *But by a prophet did the Lord bring Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he guarded.*

This is all that is extant of this Midrash. It is idle to speculate as to whether these are quotations from an independent work utilized by Hosea or merely a Midrashic expansion written by the prophet to suit his needs at the moment. Perhaps the seemingly pointless Midrash in v. 5 would seem to favor the former alternative. Yet it does seem clear that we have here a fragment of a much larger prophecy and its accompanying Midrash. Notwithstanding the difficulties with which Hosea is replete, and our chapter is no exception, we have succeeded in discovering both elements of the Midrashic form in the eighth pre-Christian century.

---

[4] Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* ad. loc.

[5] Cf. Ehrlich ad loc. for an ingenious attempt to restore the connection.

V. Another Midrashic allusion in the Prophets is to be found in Isa 30 26: והיה אור הלבנה כאור החמה ואור החמה שבעתים כאור שבעת הימים. The phrase כאור שבעת הימים is lacking in LXX, and so scholars from Lowth downwards have excised it as a gloss.[6] Even those scholars who accepted the phrase as genuine generally overlooked the definite article before ימים and rendered "sevenfold, as the light of seven days."[7]

To the writer it would seem that we have here an allusion to an ancient Midrash. The Creation story in Genesis 1 speaks of the light as having been created on the first day, while the sun, moon, and stars were created on the fourth. What was this primal light that existed before the heavenly "lights" came into existence? Speculation was rife on this point in earliest times, for we meet the answer in varying form, but with unceasing persistence, in the Apocalyptic literature, in Philo, in the Talmud, the Midrashim, and the Liturgy.[8] The light that preceded the creation was a supernatural light of marvelous effulgence and power, which the Almighty hid (גנז) because he foresaw the sinfulness of later generations. We shall content ourselves with one typical quotation from B. Hagigah 12a:

אור שברא הקדוש ברוך הוא ביום הראשון אדם צופה בו מסוף העולם ועד סופו. כיון שנסתכל הקדוש ברוך הוא בדור המבול ובדור הפלגה וראה שמעשיהם מקולקלים עמד וגנזו. ולמי גנזו. לצדיקים לעתיד לבא.

"The light that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created on the first day (was so bright) that a man could see from one end of the earth to the other. But when the Holy One beheld the generation of the Flood and the generation of the Dispersion, and saw that their deeds would be corrupt, He hid it; and that for the righteous in the world to come."

---

[6] Wade, Ehrlich, and many others. Dillmann, Delitzsch recognize the *possibility* of its being original.

[7] So Vulgate, Ibn Ezra, Ottley. Kimhi, followed by Delitzsch, interprets "the light of the seven days (sc. of the week)," a rather inept figure. Maimonides (as quoted by Kimhi ad loc.) understood it as a reference to the seven days of the dedication of Solomon's Temple, though we are told that the festivities lasted fourteen days (I Kings 8 65).

[8] The references are given in detail in L. Ginzberg: *Legends of the Jews* vol. V., notes 19, 100.

Our verse seems a clear reference to this preternatural light. The phrase in question should be rendered "the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, like the light of the Seven Days (of Creation)."[9] This obvious explanation is to be found in Genesis Rabba c. 3. It also lies at the basis of the prayer recited at the Sanctification of the Moon, where our verse is paraphrased thus: ואור החמה שבעתים כאור שבעת ימי בראשית.

The long chain of Midrash is thus re-enforced by another and most important link. In this detail as well, the Bible assumes its rightful place as the fountain-head of Jewish literature. These examples of Midrash by no means exhaust this literary form in the Bible, but they are of particular significance in illustrating once again the continuity of the Jewish spirit as manifested throughout history in Prophet, Scribe and Rabbi.

---

[9] Since writing the above, I have discovered this interpretation in the Hebrew commentary on Isaiah Or Bahir, by S. Berman, Vilna 1903.

ZU JESAJA 8, VERS 9 UND 10

KARL BUDDE
UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG

VON diesen Versen hat uns Hans Schmidt eine neue Herstellung, Auslegung und Übersetzung geschenkt.[1] Sein Hauptanliegen dabei ist, die Jesajanische Herkunft des Stückes, die er mit Duhm auch in seinem Kommentar festgehalten hatte, gegenüber den meisten Neueren seit Stade zu verteidigen. Mir scheint das Wichtigste und Erfreulichste an dieser seiner neuen Behandlung etwas, was er selbst erst ganz am Schluß (S. 10) in einer einzigen Zeile feststellt; ich führe sie wörtlich an, in ihrem Zusammenschluß mit den beiden vorhergehenden Zeilen: „Die Gedichte, in deren Kreis wir das von uns Betrachtete gestellt haben, gehören sämtlich in die Zeit des Sanherib-Sturmes. *Wir werden auch Jes.* 8 9f. *aus dieser Zeit herzuleiten haben.*“ Damit berichtigt der Verfasser sein früheres Urteil. Denn in seinem Kommentar[2] steht das Stück unter „Gedichte und Prophetensprüche über den syrisch-ephraemitischen Krieg,“ und zwar an der überlieferten Stelle, zwischen 8 5—8 und 8 11—15, wird auch in dem Eingangssatz der Auslegung mit dem ihm vorhergehenden Stück ausdrücklich in innere Verbindung gebracht. Heute hebt er es aus diesem Zusammenhang heraus und setzt es in dem Lebenswerk des Propheten um volle

---

[1] *Stromata*, Festgabe des akademisch-theologischen Vereins zu Gießen im Schmalkaldener Kartell anläßlich seines 50. Stiftungstages, Leipzig 1930, S. 3—10.

[2] *Die großen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt*, Göttingen 1915, S. 78.

33 Jahre später an. Das bringt den großen Gewinn mit sich, daß nun 8 5—8 und 8 11 zusammenrücken und nicht ferner durch einen mit beiden völlig unvereinbaren Spruch von einander gesprengt werden. Zu Eingang seines Aufsatzes erteilt der Verfasser mir das Lob, daß man „meine Bemerkungen zu den Prophetentexten niemals ohne Gewinn lese“. Es sollte mich freuen, wenn ich durch meine Auslegung der Verse in dem kleinen Buche Jesaja’s Erleben,[3] von der Schmidt als „der letzten eingehenden Behandlung“ ausgeht, dazu hätte beitragen dürfen, ihn von dem Irrtum seiner früheren Ansetzung zu überzeugen.

Mit diesem großen Gewinn könnte ich mich begnügen; denn der geschlossene Zusammenhang der Denkschrift Jesajas bleibt mir von allem das Wichtigste. Daß das Stück etwa an anderer Stelle von Jesajas Hand stammen könnte, habe ich a. a. O. (S. 80) selbst in Erwägung gezogen; ich habe es abgelehnt, weil — ganz abgesehen von den formellen Bedenken — Jesaja „nirgends so bedingungslos dem Volke Israel Jahwes Schutz gegenüber der ganzen Welt zugesagt hat“. Das bleibt richtig; aber trotzdem kann man zugeben, daß für eine Episode der Sanherib-Zeit mit dem aus ungezählten Völkern ausgehobenen Heere der Weltmacht — vgl. Kap. 22 1—14 und Kap. 29 1—8 — und als ein Einzelspruch unter vielen, die ihn erläuterten und ergänzten, unser Stück in Jesajas Munde dem Sinne nach nicht undenkbar wäre.

Aber daneben wird es doch nicht überflüssig sein, auch die Fassung des Spruchs näher ins Auge zu fassen, zumal Hans Schmidt dazu Neues und Besseres meint bieten zu können, und ich doch auch dies und jenes *pro domo* einzuwenden habe. Nicht ohne Humor bespricht Schmidt im Eingang seines Aufsatzes meine Behandlung der Verse. Ich erschrak vor mir selbst angesichts der Plerophorie meines Verdammungsurteils, als ich bei Schmidt dessen Anführung las: „Tönende Gemeinplätze, handwerksmäßig klappende[4] Verszeilen, prahlerische Wiederholung und hohles Pathos.“ Erst als ich sah, daß das zweite Paar davon eine reichliche Seite später, auf S. 81, sich findet, an richtiger Stelle und aus neuem Anlaß, durfte ich mich darüber beruhigen. Und nun zu den Einzelheiten. Die Änderung des schwierigen ersten Wortes רעוּ in דְּעוּ nach LXX *γνῶτε*,[5] wodurch zugleich der volle Parallelismus mit dem וְהַאֲזִינוּ der folgenden Zeile hergestellt wird, lehnt Schmidt ab und versteht seinerseits רעו als *impt. Ḳal* von רוּעַ. Ich meine, er sollte dann nicht eine Analogiebildung nach ע״ע annehmen, sondern einfach רֻעוּ sprechen, wie denn שֻׁבוּ und קֻמוּ häufig genug vorkommen. Aber diese einzige *Ḳal*-Form anzunehmen, neben massenhaften *Hiphil*-Formen, worunter allein 14 Imperative in derselben Bedeutung, scheint mir doch sehr gewagt. Und wenn die Vertreter des דְּעוּ dadurch, wie Schmidt hervorhebt, genötigt werden, das erste חֹתּוּ zu streichen oder zu ändern, so kommt er selbst kaum leichter davon, da er nun das Parallelwort האזינו ändern oder mindestens umdeuten muß. Sein Vorschlag dafür aber scheint mir besonders bedenklich zu sein. Er gewinnt aus Dtn. 23 14 — dies die einzige Stelle — ein Substantivum אָזֵן, das er als die Zusammenfassung von „Waffen“ und „Schanzzeug“ (des einzelnen Kriegers) und damit als „die Rüstung in ihrer Gesamtheit“ meint verstehn zu dürfen. Von diesem Substantivum aber leitet er ein nirgends bezeugtes Verbum — wie es scheint, bleibt er beim *Hiphil* — in der Bedeutung „zur Rüstung greifen“ ab, das „in der Mitte stehen würde zwischen dem Alarmsignal (רעו) und dem ‚Umschnallen‘, dem Anlegen der Waffen (הִתְאַזְּרוּ) auf der andern Seite“. Aber wie konnte er nur übersehen, was in allen neueren Kommentaren zum Deuteronomium—König macht eine Ausnahme—gebucht wird, daß LXX in Dtn. 23 14 עַל־אֲזֵנֶךָ mit *ἐπὶ τῆς ζώνης σου* wiedergibt, Hieronymus mit *in balteo*! Ich hatte, ehe ich zu Versionen und Kommentaren griff, am Texte bereits die Berichtigung עַל־אֵזֹרֶךָ „an deinem Gürtel, deinem Koppel“ vollzogen, die allein einen verständigen Sinn gibt.[6] Dann aber fand ich diese Herstellung schon von Steuernagel geboten und in seine Übersetzung aufgenommen, wie denn auch seit Dillmann die Kommentare die Rückübersetzung des ζώνη der LXX in אֵזוֹר nicht vermissen lassen. Damit fällt für H. Schmidts Erklärung jede Stütze dahin, und es muß, solange nichts Besseres geboten wird, bei dem „und horchet“ des Textes bleiben.[7] Dafür aber und für die Unrichtigkeit des ihm vorausgehenden ersten וחתו spricht auch noch ein anderes, daß nämlich hinter ihm die Parallele zu diesem וחתו fehlt. „Blast Alarm, ihr Völker, und brecht zusammen! Rüstet euch, all ihr Weiten der Erde!“ — so Schmidts Übersetzung — ist kein ausreichender Parallelismus. Den hatte ich für das bisherige Verständnis dieser Zeilen hergestellt, indem ich יַחְדָו für וחתו einsetzte.[8] Daß das „eine starke Entleerung des Textes“ zur Folge hätte, wie Schmidt meint, ist doch das Gegenteil von dem offenbaren Tatbestand. Denn, was Schmidt durch seine Umdeutungen gewinnt mit seinem:

---

[3] J. E., eine gemeinverständliche Auslegung der Denkschrift des Propheten (Kap. 6 1—9 6), Gotha 1928.

[4] So bei mir S. 80, nicht „klappernde“, wie es irrtümlich bei Schmidt heißt.

---

[5] Bei mir verschrieben in *γνῶθε*.

[6] Wäre das Schäufelchen als *ein* Gegenstand unter vielen eingeführt, so würde man בַּאזנך oder עִם אזנך erwarten; auch müßte Anweisung gegeben

Blast Alarm, ihr Völker,
  und brecht zusammen!
Rüstet euch, all ihr Weiten der Erde!

sind nur anderthalb verfrühte Wiederholungen der beiden folgenden Zeilen:

Tut die Waffen um
  und brecht zusammen!
Tut die Waffen um
  und brecht zusammen![9]

---

sein, es aus deren Bestande *mitzunehmen*. Nur, daß der Mann es ohnedies eben am Koppel, zur Hand hat, erklärt den Wortlaut.

[7] Wie unwahrscheinlich es ohnehin ist, daß der so häufige Anruf הַאֲזִינוּ in einer ganz anderen Bedeutung sollte verwendet sein, wie sicher sich dadurch Mißverständnis einstellen mußte, mag am Rande vermerkt sein.

[8] Aber nicht יַחְדָיו, wie Schmidt S. 5 aus Versehen mich schreiben läßt. Vielmehr umschreibe ich S. 81 die Konsonanten ganz unmißverständlich *jhdw*. Der fünfte Konsonant vermindert sehr erheblich die der Identität nahekommende graphische Leichtigkeit meiner Ersatzlesart. Und יַחְדָיו dafür einzusetzen, ist nicht der geringste Anlaß, da diese schlechtere Schreibung sich nur 3mal gegen rund 90 der anderen findet.

[9] Ich gebe Schmidt’s eigene Übersetzungen auf S. 8.

die doch mit ihrem doppelten Vortrag des Guten schon reichlich genug tun. Dafür aber gibt er völlig preis die schöne Einführung:

> Vernehmt's, ihr Völker, zumal,
> Und horchet, alle Fernen der Erde:[10]

Da ist also das „Entleeren“ ganz auf seiner Seite. Freilich scheint ihm diese „doppelte Aufforderung“ vor einer neuen Aufforderung, und daß „so ungleichartige Geschwister wie ‚vernehmet‘, ‚lauschet‘ und ‚legt eine Rüstung an‘ nebeneinander aufmarschieren, nicht sinnvoll“. Er vergißt, daß im Hebräischen zwei Imperative hintereinander, nur durch „und“ miteinander verbunden, gar keine Aufforderung bilden, sondern der lebhafte Ausdruck für einen Bedingungssatz sind (Ges. Kautzsch, § 110 f), also „*Wenn* ihr die Waffen umtun werdet, *so* werdet ihr zusammenbrechen“.[11] So bildet in der Tat 9b die Verkündigung, zu deren Entgegennahme die Betroffenen in 9a aufgefordert werden. Und diese feierliche Aufforderung, aufzumerken, ist wahrlich, wo es sich um „alle Fernen der Erde“ handelt, ebenso am Platze wie die an Himmel und Erde in Jes. 1, 2. Aber wesentlich verbessert wird sie, was ich nicht verfehlt habe auf S. 81 zu betonen, durch mein יַחְדָּו für וָחֹתּוּ׃, weil erst mit dem „ihr Völker *zumal*“ = „allesamt“ die Anrede im ersten Gliede der im zweiten, „alle Fernen der Erde“, ebenbürtig und zugleich rhythmisch gleich gewichtig wird. Das יַחְדָּו ist deshalb keineswegs bloß ein Füllwort, wie Schmidt es S. 5 nennt. Ich muß also, solange kein besserer Ersatz dafür geboten wird als der Hans Schmidts, bei meinem Vorschlag bleiben.

Ich bin zum Verteidiger des Spruchs geworden, an dem mir doch nicht eben viel gelegen ist. Denn neben dem Zugeständnis, das oben (S. 424) hinsichtlich des Sinnes gemacht ist, kann ich doch nach wie vor seine rednerische und dichterische Fassung eines Jesaja nicht für würdig erachten. Viel eher stellt er sich mir neben Verse wie 2 22; 3 10, 11; 3 25, 26; 5 15, 16, die ebenfalls dichterisch gemeint sind, aber ebenso den Zusammenhang unterbrechen, schwache Fassung aufweisen und nicht von Jesaja herrühren dürften. Und dafür spricht mir hier auch das abschließende כִּי עִמָּנוּאֵל, in dem das Ganze gipfelt. Ich muß es für recht unwahrscheinlich halten, daß Jesaja dieses eigentliche Stichwort der Zeit des Syrisch-Ephraimitischen Krieges, das Merkzeichen des heiligen Restes, des neuen Geschlechts nach überstandenem Läuterungsgericht — nicht, wie Schmidt (S. 10) wieder sagt, der Name „des Kindes auf dem Thron, von dem Jes. 9 und 11 sprechen" — 33 Jahre später als neue Aussage sollte wiederbenutzt haben. Zudem sind nach 10 5ff. und allen Texten, die sich sonst auf die Sanherib-Zeit beziehen (1 2—20; 22 1—14; Kap. 28ff.) die Gründe, die Jahwe bestimmen, Jerusalem nicht in Feindeshand fallen zu lassen, ganz andere, als man sie aus dem „Mit uns ist Gott" erschließen sollte, und auch der Prophet kann sich zu dieser Zeit schwerlich so mit dem Volke eins fühlen, wie das triumphierende „Mit uns ist Gott" es voraussetzt. Ich muß deshalb meinen Erklärungsversuch für die Entstehung des Spruchs, den Schmidt zu Eingang seines Aufsatzes anführt, immer noch für wahrscheinlicher halten. Aber die Hauptsache bleibt mir, daß die Verse von ihrer überlieferten Stelle entfernt, aus dem Zusammenhang von Kap. 8 herausgehoben werden, und darin bin ich nun mit Hans Schmidt zu meiner Freude einig.

---

[10] Meine Wiedergabe S. 79.

[11] Das gilt für den Sinn. Natürlich kann man trotzdem mit zwei Imperativen übersetzen, was füglich im Deutschen ebenso verstanden wird wie im Hebräischen.

COMMUNICATION

A Further Example of Paronomasia on Jerusalem

In connection with the Paronomasia on the name, Jerusalem (JBL, 1930, pp. 277—282), Professor Montgomery has overlooked a most important opinion of Ben Bagbag and Ben Hehe. They agree that Jerusalem was named by Abraham after his unsuccessful attempt to slaughter Isaac there. The angels were so touched at the sight that they wept a torrent of tears causing an *early rain* יורֶה which so drenched Abraham that the dear old patriarch could not see his knife before his face. It was, as Abraham said, a יורֶה שָׁלֵם a *complete cloud burst.* By the time Abraham had recovered from the drenching it occurred to him that this was a sign from on high not to kill Isaac. And when father and son left the mountain top, the smouldering altar and the remains of the unfortunate ram, they agreed that it was the most complete early rain on record at the Palestinian Meteorological station and they were so full of talk about יורֶה שָׁלֵם that the place was ever after so called. Ben Bagbag's and Ben Hehe's famous book on this subject, called "Rain in due season", was published at the press of Meshullam Rieti in Catania in 1518.

David W. Amram, Esq.,
Philadelphia.

Brief Note on Pseudo-Ezekiel

Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XVIII), Charles Cutler Torrey. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1930. pp. 119. $ 2.00.

On grounds of the double dating, the Jewish tradition, literary relationships especially to Second Isaiah, apparent miraculous clairvoyance, references to Persia and Alexander the Great, and above all the overwhelmingly pervasive Aramaic flavor in diction and phraseology, Professor Torrey here presents a cogent argument for his view that Ezekiel was written in Palestine c. 230 B.C. It is a pseudepigraph like Daniel, 4 Ezra or Revelation, which was originally dated in the thirtieth year of Manasseh, and later retouched under the influence of the Chronicler so as to put it in Babylon during the years 592—570 B.C. Without question this volume represents an extremely important contribution to Old Testament scholarship. (G. D.)

BOOKS RECEIVED

Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus. Veröffentlichungen der Chajes-Preisstiftung, III. Band. By Salomo Rappaport. Frankfurt, 1930.

Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage und ihre Beziehung zum Jenseitsglauben und Totenkultus der Antike. By Emil Freistedt. Münster, 1928.

Anfänge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung. Vol. II, Parts 1 and 2. By J. Ficker. Leipzig, 1929.

Augsburgische Konfession und Luthers Katechismen. By K. Thieme. Giessen, 1930.

Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament.

- Dritte Folge, Heft 8: Otto Bauernfeind, Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium. Stuttgart, 1927.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 9: Lic. Karl Elliger, Die Einheit des Tritojesaia (Jesaia 56—66). Stuttgart, 1929.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 10: Lic. theol. Martin Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. Stuttgart, 1929.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 11: Gerhard von Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium. Stuttgart, 1929.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 12: Albrecht Alt, Der Gott der Väter. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der israelitischen Religion. Stuttgart, 1929.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 13: Alexander Sperber, Septuagintaprobleme I. Stuttgart, 1929.
- Dritte Folge, Heft 15: Karl Cramer, Amos, Versuch einer theologischen Interpretation. Stuttgart, 1930.

Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon. By Ernst Lohmeyer. Göttingen, 1930.

Buch Genesis. (Bonner Bibel, Vol. I.)

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. By R. H. Charles. Oxford, 1929.

Dynamismus und Personalismus in der Seelenauffassung. By Alfred Bertholet. Tübingen, 1930.

Evolution and Christianity. By J. W. Gibbs. Memphis, 1930.

The Fourth Gospel. By H. Odeberg. Uppsala, 1929.

Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Dodekapropheton. Einzelwörterbücher zum Alten Testament, Heft 5. By Nikolaus Fries. Giessen, 1930.

Hebrew Union College Annual. Vol. VI. Board of Editors—Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Julian Morgenstern, Sheldon H. Blank, Secretary. Philadelphia, 1929.

Jesus and the Law of Moses. By B. H. Branscomb. New York, 1930.

Josephus, the Man and the Historian. By H. St. John Thackeray. New York, 1929.

Kant's Conception of God.

Karl Budde's Schrifttum. (Beiheft zur ZATW, Heft 54.) Giessen, 1930.

Messias, Der. By Hugo Gressmann. Göttingen, 1929.

Novum Testamentus Graece. By E. Nestle. Stuttgart, 1930.

Oriental Institute Communications, University of Chicago. Chicago, Ill.
- No. 2: Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor. By H. H. von der Osten.
- No. 3: First Report of the Prehistoric Survey Expedition. By K. S. Sandford and W. J. Arkell.
- No. 4: The Excavation of Armageddon. By Clarence S. Fisher.
- No. 5: Medinet Habu-. By H. H. Nelson and U. Hoelscher. 1924—28.
- No. 6: Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor. By H. H. von der Osten. 1927—28.

Palästinajahrbuch des Deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes zu Jerusalem. Vol. XX—XXII, 1924 to 26, ed. Gustaf Dalman; Vol. XXIII—XXV, 1927—30, ed. Albrecht Alt.

Passion Week. By Walter E. Bundy. New York, 1930.

Profetie des Amos. By A. Weiser. (Beiheft zur ZATW.) Giessen, 1929.

Qohaelaeth. By H. Odeberg. Uppsala, 1930.

Spirit in Evolution from Amoeba to Saint. By Herbert F. Standing. New York, 1930.

Sumerian Lexical Texts from the Temple School of Nippur. By E. Chiera. Chicago, 1930.

The Tower of Babel. By Hugo Gressmann. Ed. by J. Obermann. New York, 1928.

Use of the Bible in Milton's Prose. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XIV, No. 3. By H. F. Fletcher. 1929.

List closed August 29, 1930.

PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 30th and 31st, 1929

THE sixty-fifth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was called to order by the President, Professor James E. Frame, at 10:30 A.M. on December 30th, 1929, at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. The reports of the Corresponding Secretary and of the Recording Secretary were read and ordered to be filed. Oral reference was made to some of the members whose deaths were reported by the Recording Secretary, and at the request of the Society Dr. Pfeiffer and President Moulton were appointed by the President to draft a minute in memory of Professor W. R. Arnold, and to draft a similar minute for Professor Rudolf Kittel, Professors Fullerton and Hussey were appointed.

The report of the Treasurer was read. To audit it Dean Russell and Professor Meek were appointed, with the further request that they should offer a suggestion for the disposal of the legacy to the Society from our late member, Professor I. N. Casanowicz.

The President appointed as a committee to nominate officers of the Society for next year Professors Fowler, Lane, Batten, Dr. Marcus and Mrs. Lyman. After a brief announcement by Professor E. G. Kraeling on behalf of the Committee on Arrangements, the following papers were read and discussed:

By J. E. Frame: Paul's Idea of Deliverance (Presidential Address).
By J. J. Obermann: The Good Shepherd.
By H. T. Fowler: Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians.
By C. R. Bowen: The Fourth Gospel as Drama.

Monday Afternoon, December 30. The Society reconvened about 2:10. The following papers were read and discussed:

By C. S. Knopf: The Optimism of Koheleth.

By Ralph Marcus: The Armenian Translation of Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesin.*

By B. W. Bacon: The Latin Prologue to John in the Light of Recent Discovery.

By Mary Ely Lyman: Hermetic Religion and the Religion of the Fourth Gospel.

Thereupon the Society divided into two Sections. In the New Testament Section the following papers were read and discussed:

By G. A. Barton: "A bone of Him shall not be broken," John 19 36.

By Elbert Russell: Some Assumptions of Johannine Criticism.

By B. A. Elzas: A Parallel to Luke 23 37.

By F. J. F. Jackson: Stephen's Speech in Acts 7.

The Old Testament Section, presided over by Vice-President Badè, heard and discussed papers, as follows:

By L. W. Batten: A Crisis in the History of Israel.

By E. G. Kraeling: The Immanuel Prophecy.

By R. P. Dougherty: Sennacherib and the Walled Cities of Palestine.

By B. A. Elzas: A Note on Jeremiah 31 22.

Monday Evening, December 30. The Society met at 8 P.M. The Session was held as a meeting of the Fund for Biblical and Oriental Archaeological Research, with Professor Barton in the chair. The following papers were presented:

By W. J. Moulton: Report of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

By W. F. Badè: The Tell-en-Nasbe Expedition, 1929.

By R. H. Pfeiffer: The Second Campaign of the Harvard-Baghdad School Expedition at Kirkuk.

By G. S. Duncan: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Bible Lands.

Tuesday Morning, December 31. The Society met at 9:30 A.M. The committee appointed for the purpose produced memorial minutes on Professors Arnold and Kittel. These were adopted, and the Secretary was instructed to send copies to the families of the deceased and to the institutions which they served. They are, as follows:

> In the death of Professor William R. Arnold of Harvard University, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis loses a former president and one of its most distinguished members.

William R. Arnold was born in Beirut on November 14, 1872. He received his A. B. degree from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1892 and completed his theological course in Union Theological Seminary in 1895. One year later he obtained his Ph. D. degree from Columbia University and published his dissertation entitled *Babylonian Temple Records*. He served two years as curator of the department of Antiquities of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (1896—98) and in 1902 he was called to the chair of Old Testament in Andover Theological Seminary that had been left vacant through the call of George Foot Moore to Harvard University. Twenty years later he became Hancock Professor in Harvard University. He died suddenly while seated at his desk in the afternoon of December 11, 1929.

He wrote sparingly and carefully, but his publications are models of accurate scholarship, sound judgement, and matchless style. Among his most important works are, *The Composition of Nahum* (1901), *The Divine Name in Ex.* 3 15 (1905), *The Rhythms of the Ancient Hebrews* (1908), *The Passover Papyrus from Elephantine* (1912), *Ephod and Ark* (1917), and *Observations on the Origin of Holy Scripture* (1923).

Professor Arnold was also a great teacher: exacting in his standards, demanding the best that a pupil could achieve, inspiring, friendly and warm-hearted in spite of his apparent severity.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis is aware of its great loss in the death of Professor Arnold and expresses its sympathy to his family and to his university.

On Oct. 20th last, Professor Rudolf Kittel of the University of Leipzig, an honorary member of this Society, died in the seventy-seventh year of his age. The last scientific work which he was privileged to complete was the final volume of his *Geschichte des Volkes Israels* (1929). This book was dedicated to our Society in recognition of his election to honorary membership in it. It is a pity that Dr. Kittel could not have been apprised of the satisfaction which the Society takes in the fact he wished to have its name thus associated with what is the culmination of his life-work.

It is not easy to record in a few words the accomplishment of a life so rich and full as Dr. Kittel's. He makes the well substantiated claim that his History in its various editions is, to a considerable degree, a reflection of the development of Old Testament study during the past forty years. In view of his dedication of the last volume of this work to our Society, it seems appropriate to say a word about its fortunes. The first edition of Vol. I appeared in 1888, of Vol. II in 1892. In those days the Wellhausen hypothesis was sweeping every thing before it. Dr. Kittel, though at that time a young man and largely unknown, dared to challenge the views of the reigning school at a most vital point, the date of the Priest's Code. The result was reflected in the immediate fate of the *Geschichte*. Though it was translated into English in 1895, it was looked upon with suspicion in Germany, and there was no call for a second edition of Vol. II until seventeen years later (1909) or of Vol. I until twenty-four years later (1912). Meanwhile the decipherment of the monuments went on apace. An undreamed of background for the History of Israel was disclosed. Professor Kittel was quick to see the consequence of this for criticism. The emphasis of his History was now shifted from the discussion of the literary problems of the Biblical sources to the inclusion of the cultural data drawn from the new extra-Biblical sources of information. In this particular his History has been preeminent among all the modern histories of Israel. The new orientation of the work soon attracted the public attention which had been largely denied to it in its original form, and in 1923 Vol. I reached the sixth edition, and in 1925 the seventh edition of Vol. II appeared. This remarkable change in attitude toward the History is most significant of the change in the tendency of Old Testament criticism since the War, and whether one agrees with its point of view or not, it may safely be maintained that Kittel's *Geschichte des Volkes Israels* in its final form is the greatest of all modern works in this field and is likely to maintain its preeminence for many years to come.

The other distinctive contribution of Dr. Kittel to Old Testament study is the *Biblia Hebraica* (1905—06, 2nd ed. 1913), a work which cost an immense amount of labor. Upon a thorough revision for a third edition of it Dr. Kittel was engaged at the time of his death. This work has been sharply criticised, and Dr. Kittel, himself, freely admitted that it by no means came up to the ideal which he had in mind. But the extensive use made of it throughout the learned world in the past twenty-five years has shown that it has filled an acutely felt want in a very practical and helpful way. The third edition, of which Genesis and Isaiah have appeared, with the cooperation of Professor Kahle, promises to be of very great importance for the revision of the Massoretic text. The influence of Professor Kittel has extended far beyond the borders of his own country. Beside the English translation of his *History of the Hebrews*, he edited Chronicles for the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* series. His *Babylonian Excavations and early Biblical History* went through three editions in its English form (1904—1908), followed in 1911 by *The Scientific Study of the Bible* and in 1925 by *The Religion of the People of Israel*. Finally, in the present year, *Great Men and Movements in Israel* was published in which Dr. Kittel gathered some of the main results of his studies embodied in his History about the various Old Testament personages, in keeping with an ideal of his to attempt to reveal the life of ancient Israel, that beat behind the books of the Old Testament. Mindful of Dr. Kittel's own interest in the men behind the books, it is impossible not to pay tribute in conclusion to the remarkable character of the man, Rudolf Kittel, himself, which impressed all who had the privilege of knowing him personally. A deeply pious man, simple in his ways but of great dignity, ruggedly honest, seeking to make learning minister to life, of great personal bravery as was evidenced when at the risk of his life he saved the University of Leipzig from pillage by the Communists, our Society feels itself honored in having upon its rolls the name of Dr. Kittel, one of the most distinguished scholars and noblest characters in German academic circles. We deeply regret his loss to many of us personally and to the cause of Biblical Scholarship.

The report of the Council was presented by the Recording Secretary. A number of persons recommended by the Council for membership were elected. Other recommendations submitted to the Society in the form of minutes of the Council were approved. They are as follows:

"Suggestions for honorary members were considered, but it was recommended that the incoming President and Recording Secretary be appointed a committee with power to add to their members, to consider somewhat systematically suitable candidates for election as honorary members, such names to be acted on next year or later."

"To permit the election of more than two honorary members next year, the Council recommends that the last sentence of paragraph IV of the Constitution limiting the election of honorary members to two in any given year be suspended in the semi-centennial year 1930."

"It was recommended that the Society adopt the suggestion to provide a suitable celebration next year of its fiftieth anniversary and authorize the present President to nominate a committee to make plans for it. Among the recommendations of the Council to be referred to that committee are the suggestion that Foreign Societies of Biblical Scholars be invited to send representatives to the occasion and that a dinner be arranged at a moderate price for the members and guests."

"The time and place of the next meeting of the Society were discussed. Both matters were left to the committee in charge of the next meeting, with the recommendation that, unless some reasons for change appear, the meeting be held on Monday and Tuesday, December 29th and 30th, 1930."

"The problem of the general character of our meetings was discussed. The value of the symposium as an element in our programs was emphasized as well as the importance of allowing our members opportunity to offer for criticism materials on subjects of their own choosing.

It was recommended that to prevent overcrowding of the program, the Secretary be authorized to arrange in advance if it seems desirable for the dicvision of the Society, at one or more sessions, into two simultaneous sections to consider papers of special interest to Old and New Testament scholars, respectively, as well as to arrange for papers of more general interest to be presented to the Society as a whole."

"To give more time and opportunity for discussion, it was recommended that persons who offer a paper be required to submit with the title of the paper an abstract of it, not over 100 words in length. Copies of these abstracts are to be circulated among the members intending to attend the meetings.

It is recommended that papers be presented in three ways:

1) By summary oral presentation whenever possible.
2) By reading in full, if necessary for clear presentation.
3) By title only, whenever the subject matter is such that it cannot be easily followed in oral presentation, or whenever the member cannot be present in person, or when the paper can be brought adequately to the attention of the members merely by publication in the Journal."

"A proposal that the Society recommend to the American Council of Learned Societies the preparation of a Hellenistic Lexicon was referred to the Society as a whole. Dr. Marcus was asked to explain it at the next session."

"To provide for a somewhat larger and more continuous membership in the Council, the following change in the wording of the Constitution, Article III, was recommended to the Society:

> The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who with nine others shall be united in a Council. These shall be elected annually by the Society, with the exception of the Corresponding Secretary, who shall be elected annually by the Council, and of the nine members of the Council three of whom shall be elected each year for a term of three years. Additional members of the Council shall be the President of the Society for the preceding year and the Presidents of the Sections hereinafter provided for."

To serve as the committees named, the President appointed on the committee to consider the advisability of a Hellenistic dictionary Professors Hatch, C. H. Kraeling, Marcus, Margolis, and Ropes; on the committee to plan for the Fiftieth Anniversary meeting, Professors Montgomery, Moulton, Bewer, Obermann and Bowen.

It was voted to recommend to the publishing committee that the Journal be issued quarterly instead of semi-annually.

The auditing committee reported that they had examined the statement and books of the Treasurer and had found them correct.

The following officers suggested by the Nominating Committee were elected by ballot by the Society to serve (except as otherwise designated) for one year:

Dean W. F. Badè	*President*
Prof. B. S. Easton	*Vice-President*
Prof. H. H. Tryon	*Treasurer*
Prof. H. J. Cadbury	*Secretary*
Prof. Moses Bailey	*Associates in Council*
Prof. D. W. Riddle	
Mrs. Mary E. Lyman	
Prof. H. S. Gehman	
Prof. H. C. Alleman	
Pres. W. J. Moulton	*Representative on the Board of Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
Prof. W. F. Albright (until 1932)	*Delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies*
Prof. H. J. Cadbury (until 1934)	

A symposium discussion on *Backgrounds of the Fourth Gospel* was introduced by the reading of the following papers:

By Millar Burrows: The Original Language.
By C. H. Kraeling: Contemporary Religious Currents.
By G. H. C. Macgregor: Christian Experience.

Tuesday Afternoon, December 31. The Society gathered about 2 P.M. On motion it was voted to send a letter of thanks to Union Theological Seminary for their generous hospitality to the Society this year. The following papers were read by title:

By A. R. Siebens: The Wellhausen Theory Concerning the Hezekian Reform.
By George Jeshurun: Deuteronomy 12 4.
By L. I. Newman: The "Fear of the Lord" in Hebrew Literature.

By W. F. Albright: Some Problems of the Study of Hebrew Personal Names.
By G. R. Berry: Was Ezekiel in the Exile?

The Society divided as before into twos ections and listened to papers as follows:

In the New Testament section which adjourned at about 3:30:

By D. W. Riddle: The Occasion of Luke-Acts.
By J. R. Cheney: A Jerusalem Church Tradition of the Holy Spirit.
By S. V. McCasland: The Origin of the Lord's Day.
By H. J. Cadbury: The Passing of a N. T. *Hapax Legomenon.*

In the Old Testament section which adjourned at about 4:30:

By M. L. Margolis: Reading the Septuagint.
By Kemper Fullerton: Double Entendre in the First Speech of Eliphaz.
By W. N. Donovan: The Nabopolassar Chronicle.
By T. J. Meek: The Translation of *ger* in the Pentateuch and its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis.
By H. S. Gehman: The Ethiopic Versions of Kings.
By Salo Baron: The Authenticity of the Numbers in the Historical Books of the O. T.
By L. E. Fuller: The Use of the Term Messianic.
By H. L. Gordon: Abraham Ibn Ezra's Cryptic Exegeses.
By J. A. Montgomery: Paronomasiae on the Name Jerusalem.

HENRY J. CADBURY, *Recording Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

During the year, the 1929 volume (XLVIII) of the Journal has appeared, as usual, in two instalments. The first double number, Parts I and II, was devoted to the extremely interesting symposium on "Primitive Christianity and Judaism". Parts III and IV consisted of a number of articles on a wide variety of topics.

The Journal depends almost entirely upon the interest and industry of the members of this Society for its material. If the high standard set by previous years is to be maintained, it is absolutely essential that a large number of interesting and scholarly contributions continue to come in to the editors.

Owing to the fact that he is to be absent from the country for the major portion of the coming year, the Corresponding Secretary is obliged regretfully to request the appointment of a successor. He takes this opportunity to thank contributors to the Journal for their many courtesies, in particular for their patience with the delays incident to printing at long range.

December 30, 1929.

Respectfully submitted,
GEORGE DAHL, *Corresponding Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY

The active members of the Society appear to number at present 442, which is an increase of thirty over the number reported last year. 44 new members elected last year have now been added to the Society.

Our honorary member, Professor Rudolf Kittel, of Leipzig, died October 20, 1929.

The deaths of the following members have been reported:

Professor F. Watson Hannan, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J., on February 11, 1929.
Professor Jacob Streibert, Gambier, Ohio, probably on February 11, 1929.
Professor E. E. Nourse, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., on April 30, 1929.
Henry A. Sherman, New York City, N. Y. aobut May 1, 1929.
Rabbi Louis A. Mischkind, Wilmington, Delaware, on June 19, 1929.
Reverend Walter A. Matos, Swarthmore, Penna., on August 9, 1929.
Professor William R. Arnold, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on December 11, 1929.

Elected in 1883, Professor Streibert was, with one exception, the member of oldest standing in the Society.

December 26, 1929.

Respectfully submitted,
HENRY J. CADBURY, *Recording Secretary.*

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1929

Receipts

Balance forward	$ 2791.64
Dues	1284.35
Dues for American Schools of Oriental Research	19.00
Reprints	10.00
Yale Press	484.92
Legacy of I. M. Casanowicz	150.00
Interest	280.91
Total	$ 5020.82

Disbursements

Printing and Postage	$ 62.72
Clerical service	45.34
Secretary's expenses	20.50
Editorial expenses	88.43
Printing Journal	1394.31
Dues for American Schools of Oriental Research	19.00
Exchange	—.70
	$ 1631.00
Balance	3389.82
	$ 5020.82

Distribution of Balance:

New First National Bank, Meadville, Pa.	$ 2424.12
Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co.	938.70
Undeposited checks	27.00
	$ 3389.82

The above account, covering transactions to date, is respectfully submitted.

December 27, 1929.

Millar Burrows, *Treasurer*

Audited and found correct

December 30, 1929.

Elbert Russel, Théopile J. Meek,
Auditing Committee.

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY[1]

HONORARY MEMBERS

Prof. A. Bertholet, D. Theol., Preußenallee 36, Charlottenburg 9, Berlin, Germany.
Prof. K. Budde, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. F. C. Burkitt, M. A., Cambridge, England.
Prof. Gustav Dalman, Theol. D., Greifswald, Germany.
Prof. Ernst von Dobschütz, D. D., Halle, Germany.
Prof. Hermann Gunkel, D. Theol., Halle, Germany.
Prof. A. Jülicher, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. Marie Joseph Lagrange, Jerusalem (care of M. Gabalda, 90 Rue Bonaparte, Paris).
Prof. A. H. Sayce, D. D., Oxford, England.
Prof. G. A. Smith, D. D., Aberdeen, Scotland.

ACTIVE MEMBERS[2]

(693) '22 Rev. G. Abbott-Smith, D. D., D. C. L., 3475 University St., Montreal, Canada.
(593) '20 Prof. Arthur Adams, Ph. D., Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
(242) '92 Pres. Cyrus Adler, Ph. D., 2041 North Broad St., Phila., Pa.
(731) '22 Rev. Abel Ahlquist, 19 Bassett St., New Britain, Conn.
(969) '30 Rev. W. H. C. Ainley, Rockport, Tex.
(576) '17 Wm. Foxwell Albright, Ph. D., 3302 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.
(466) '11 Prof. Herbert C. Alleman, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.
(415) '07 Prof. Fredereck L. Anderson, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
(934) '29 Miss Mary E. Andrews, A. M., B. D., 5757 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.
(711) '22 Rev. Prof. S. Angus, Ph. D., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(901) '28 Rev. Otto J. Baab, M. A., Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill.

---

[1] This list has been corrected up to Nov. 1, 1930. Members are requested to notify the Recording Secretary, H. J. Cadbury, Bryn Mawr, Pa., of any change of address.

[2] The two numbers prefixed to the name of each member indicate the order and date of his accession to membership in the Society.

(184) '88 Prof. B. W. Bacon, D. D., 244 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn.
(373) '04 Dean Wm. Frederic Badè, Ph. D., D. D., Litt. D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.
(926) '29 Prof. John William Bailey, Ph. D., 2206 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.
(690) '22 Prof. Moses Bailey, Ph. D., 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass.
(722) '22 Prof. J. F. Balzer, M. A., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
(825) '26 Albert E. Barnett, 1032 18th Ave. S., Nashville, Tenn.
(210) '91 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph. D., N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(927) '29 Prof. Salo Baron, 40 West 68th St., N. Y. City.
(211) '91 Prof. L. W. Batten, Ph. D., 6 Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(902) '28 Prof. H. M. Battenhouse, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
(561) '16 Prof. John W. Beardslee, Jr., Ph. D., D. D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(828) '26 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, S. T. B., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
(694) '22 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
(970) '30 Prof. A. D. Beittel, Ph. D., Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
(829) '26 Miss Marion J. Benedict, Ph. D., Sweetbriar College, Sweetbriar, Va.
(718) '22 Rev. C. D. Benjamin, Ph. D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa.
(568) '16 Rev. C. Theodore Benze, Lutheran Seminary, Mt. Airy, Pa.
(830) '26 Rev. J. Buchanan Bernardin, Th. D., St. Mark's School, Southborough, Mass.
(326) '99 Prof. George R. Berry, D. D., Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.
(318) '98 Prof. Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D., D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
(618) '21 Pres. James A. Blaisdell, Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif.
(843) '26 F. D. Bone, Box 17, McMurry College, Abilene, Texas.
(928) '29 Prof. Osborne Booth, B. A., B. D., Bethany, W. Va.
(971) '30 Rev. Guido Bossard, A. M., D. D., Presbyterian Theo. Sem., Dubuque, Iowa.
(986) '30 The Rev. Floyd E. Bosshardt, 457 S. Baker St., Winona, Minnesota.
(972) '30 Prof. J. S. Boughton, Ph. D., Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.
(795) '25 Prof. Clarence Bouma, A. M., Th. D., Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(887) '27 Rev. Boone M. Bowen, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
(423) '08 Prof. Clayton R. Bowen, Th. D., 5707 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.
(929) '29 Rev. Wm. M. Bradner, B. D., 1 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

(903) '28 Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
(930) '29 Fred G. Bratton, Ph. D., University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.
(931) '29 Mr. Baruch Braunstein, Apt. 9F, 395 Riverside Drive, N. Y. City.
(311) '97 Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, Hotel Holley, 36 Washington Sq. West, New York City.
(831) '26 Rev. Mitchell Bronk, D. D., 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(569) '16 Mrs. Beatrice A. Brooks, Ph. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(870) '27 Prof. W. Rolfe Brown, 12 Arnold Ave., Northampton, Mass.
(719) '22 Prof. Walter E. Bundy, Ph. D., De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
(586) '18 Prof. Ernest Ward Burch, Ph. D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
(973) '30 A. L. Burgreen, 230 Portsea St., New Haven, Conn.
(747) '23 Prof. Millar Burrows, B. D., Ph. D., American University, Beirut, Syria.
(554) '15 Prof. R. Butin, S. M., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
(950) '29 Rev. Frank E. Butler, 20 Everett Av., Providence, R. I.
(689) '18 Prof. Moses Buttenwieser, Ph. D., 252 Loraine Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, O.
(471) '11 Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
(904) '28 Prof. J. Y. Campbell, 2160 Taylor Hall, New Haven, Conn.
(631) '21 Rev. James T. Carlyon, S.T.M., D.D., Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Col.
(784) '24 Prof. L. L. Carpenter, B. A., Th. D., 510 S. Johnson St., Gaffney, S. C.
(974) '30 Rev. Wesley M. Carr, Th. D., O Granbery, Juiz de Fora, Minas Geraes, Brazil.
(821) '25 Prof. J. F. B. Carruthers, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.
(951) '29 Miss Mabel R. Carter, Hollins College, Hollins, Va.
(392) '06 Prof. Shirley J. Case, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(964) '29 M. L. Cassady, Barnes Hall, Ithaca, N. Y.
(933) '29 Prof. Thomas Phelps Chalker, B. A., B. D., Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.
(222) '91 Rev. James L. Cheney, Ph. D., 1845 Roxford Road, E. Cleveland, Ohio.
(987) '30 Prof. John R. Cheney, Ph. D., Canal Fulton, Ohio.
(595) '20 Prof. Edward Chiera, Ph. D., Oriental Museum, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
(896) '27 Rev. Elmer B. Christie, B. D., 212 Fourth St., Hoquiam Wash.
(975) '30 Rev. Felix L. Cirlot, 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. Y. City.
(369) '03 Prof. Calvin M. Clark, Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(932) '29 Rev. G. A. Clarke, 276 Ryerson St., Brooklyn, N.

(998) '30 Rev. Ben H. Clinstner, 2168 S. Milwaukee Ave., Denver, Colo.
(523) '14 C. P. Coffin, 2304 Park Place, Evanston, Ill.
(606) '20 Rabbi Simon Cohen, Temple Emanu-el, 1 E. 65th St., N. Y. City.
(686) '22 Rabbi Simon R. Cohen, 75 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn. N. Y.
(935) '29 Prof. Samuel S. Cohon, A. B., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.
(889) '27 Harry Comins, 1605 Fulton Avenue, New York City.
(662) '22 David C. Cook, Elgin, Ill.
(615) '21 Rev. Francis T. Cooke, 31 Maple St., Bristol, Conn.
(582) '18 Rev. George S. Cooke, Wissahickon Inn, Redlands, Calif.
(936) '29 Miss Virginia Corwin, 787 Vose Ave., Orange, N. J.
(937) '29 Prof. Clarence T. Craig, Ph. D., D. D., Oberlin, Ohio.
(390) '06 Rev. Wm. M. Crane, Ph. D., Richmond, Mass.
(296) '96 Prof. Harlan Creelman, Ph. D., 118 North St., Auburn, N. Y.
(796) '25 Rev. Margaret B. Crook, 30 Washington Ave., Northampton, Mass.
759) '24 Prof. Earle B. Cross, Ph. D., 136 Harvard St., Rochester, N. Y.
(905) '28 Rev. Frank Monroe Crouch, 652 W. 189th St., New York City.
(819) '25 A. J. Culler, B. D., Ph. D., 2422 Woodmere Drive, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
(498) '13 Prof. D. E. Culley. Ph. D., 57 Belvidere St., Crafton, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(832) '26 A. Bruce Curry, Ph. D., Union Theol. Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., N. Y. City.
(739) '23 Prof. Muriel Streibert Curtis, B. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(401) '07 Prof. Elizabeth Czarnomska, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
(499) '13 Prof. Geo. Dahl, Ph. D., 2102 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.
(797) '25 Prof. H. E. Dana, Th. D., Seminary Hill, Texas.
(645) '21 Miss Clara W. Davidson, Pleasantville, Venango Co., Pa.
(526) '15 Prof. Israel Davidson, 531 W. 123 St., N. Y. City.
(451) '10 Prof. Richard Davidson, Ph. D., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(705) '22 M. E. Davis, Th. M., D. D., Box 178, Brownwood, Tex.
(906) '28 Rev. Edward Day, Duncan Field Library, San Antonio, Tex.
(500) '13 Prof. Frank Leighton Day, Ashland, Va.
(458) '10 Prof. Thomas F. Day, 1648 S. A. Ave., San Anselmo, Calif.
(633) '21 Prof. John Pitt Deane, M. A., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
(524) '14 Dean Irwin Hoch DeLong, Ph. D., 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa.
(121) '84 Prof. F. B. Denio, D. D., Bangor, Me.
(817) '25 Prof. W. B. Denny, 143 Seventh Ave., North, Troy, N. Y.
(723) '22 Prof. H. T. De Wolfe, D. D., Acadia Univ., Wolfville, N. S., Canada.

(619) '21 Rev. Prof. Charles Allen Dinsmore, 10 Old Hartford Turnpike, New Haven, Conn.
(417) '07 Prof. Winfred N. Donovan, Newton Centre, Mass.
(976) '30 Helen M. Doremus, M.A., 111 Montague, St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(596) '20 Prof. R. P. Dougherty, 319 Willow St., New Haven, Conn.
(823) '26 Prof. C. C. Douglas, Ph. D., 902 W. 37th St., Los Angeles, Calif.
(833) '26 Rev. Prof. John Dow, M. A., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(634) '22 Rev. Benj. R. Downer, Th. D., 1043 Laurel Ave., Kansas City, Kansas.
(664) '22 Rev. George H. Driver, 229 Eliot St., Milton, Mass.
(872) '27 Rev. Anson M. DuBois, M. A., Th. M., 32 Paul Revere Road, Arlington Heights, Mass.
(620) '21 Prof. William Haskell Dubose, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
(760) '24 Prof. George S. Duncan, 2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D.C.
(938) '29 Prof. Marion H. Dunsmore, Ph. D., 1115 Forbes St., Kalamazoo, Mich.
(382) '05 Prof. E. Olive Dutcher, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(402) '07 Prof. Burton S. Easton, Ph. D., 4 Chelsea Sq., New York City.
(844) '26 Rev. Louise Eby, B. D., 160 Claremont Ave., New York City, N.Y.
(898) '27 Rev. Frank L. Edwards, B. D., Union Congregational Church, Tuckahoe, New York.
(888) '27 Dean G. D. Edwards, A. M., Columbia, Mo.
(364) '03 Pres. F. C. Eiselen, Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(673) '22 Israel Eitan, 5176 Woodlawn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(967) '29 Virgil L. Elliot, B. A., 301 Orchard St., New Haven, Conn.
(612) '21 Rev. Barnett A. Elzas, A. B., M. D., LL. D., 42 W. 72nd St., New York.
(761) '24 Rabbi H. G. Enelow, D. D., 521 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
(403) '07 Prof. Harry Englander, 904 Lexington Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
(745) '23 Prof. Morton Scott Enslin, Th. D., 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.
(263) '94 Pres. Milton G. Evans, D. D., Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(799) '25 Prof. H. R. Fairclough, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1005 Bryant St., Palo Alto, Calif.
(800) '25 David E. Faust, B. D., Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.
(753) '23 S. Feigin, 1424 Mellon Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(939) '29 Rabbi Abraham J. Feldmann, 145 Ballard Drive, West Hartfort, Ct.
(735) '23 Pres. Carl A. Felt, The Peking Theol. Sem., Peking, China.
(862) '26 Floyd V. Filson, 2330 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
(762) '24 Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, 531 W. 123rd St., N. Y City.
(873) '27 Prof. Elmer E. Flack, Th. D., 503 E. McCreight Ave., Springfield, Ohio.

(763) '24 Rev. John W. Flight, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
(578) '17 Rev. Robert B. B. Foote, East Norwalk, Conn.
(874) '27 Bliss Forbush, Park Ave. and Laurens St., Baltimore, Md.
(629) '21 Rev. Donald F. Forrester, B. D., Ph. D., 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. City.
(441) '08 Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke, General Theological Seminary, Ninth Ave. & 20th St., New York City.
(587) '18 Rabbi Solomon Foster, B. A., 90 Treacy St., Newark, N. J.
(875) '27 Prof. William M. Fouts, Th. D., Northern Baptist Theol. Sem., 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(298) '96 Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph. D., Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
(814) '25 Rabbi Leon Fram, Congregation Beth El, Woodward at Gladstone, Detroit, Mich.
(312) '97 Prof. James E. Frame, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(671) '22 Rabbi Samuel Fredman, 6046 Washington Ave, .Philadelphia, Pa.
(752) '23 W. W. Freeman, Th. M., State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas.
(541) '15 Prof. Leslie E. Fuller, Ph. D., Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(366) '03 Prof. Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, O.
(764) '24 Prof. Frank Gavin, Th. D., General Theol.Sem., N. Y. City.
(989) '30 Prof. Fred D. Gealy, Aoyama Gakuin, Tokyo, Japan.
(765) '24 Henry S. Gehman, Ph. D., S. T. D., Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J.
(889) '27 Miss Katy Boyd George, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(750) '23 Rev. Ralph William George, S. T. B., 48 Flint St., Somerville, Mass.
(876) '27 Prof. W. C. Gibbs, B. D., College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
(198) '89 Prof. George W. Gilmore, 354 Fourth Ave., N. Y. City.
(965) '29 MacLean Gilmour, Markt 9 III bei Michaeli, Marburg, Germany.
(766) '24 Prof. Louis Ginzberg, Ph. D., Apt. 82, 508 W. 114th St., N. Y. City.
(907) '28 Miss Beatrice L. Goff, A. B., 69 Stratford Road., Melrose, Mass.
(866) '27 Rabbi Israel Goldstein, M. A., 233 W. 83rd St., New York City.
(794) '24 Rev. E. R. Goodenough, D. Phil., Woodbridge, New Haven, Conn.
(340) '00 Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(447) '09 Prof. Alex. R. Gordon, Litt. D., United Theological College, Montreal, Can.
(940) '29 Mr. Cyrus H. Gordon, M. A., 6026 Carpenter St., Philadelphia.
(867) '27 Supt. Hirsch L. Gordon, Ph. D., L. H. D., 146 Manhattan Ave., Newark, N. J.
(162) '86 Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(635) '21 Prof. William C. Graham, S. T. M., Faculty Exchange, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

(384) '05 Prof. Elihu Grant, Ph. D., Haverford, Pa.
(621) '21 Dean Frederick C. Grant, S. T. D., 2145 Orrington Ave., Evanston, Ill.
(678) '22 Rev. Oscar F. Green, P. O. Box 322, Palo Alto, Calif.
(877) '27 Rev. Caspar R. Gregory, Auburn Theol. Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.
(988) '30 Mr. Ross J. Griffith, 395 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn.
(941) '29 William A. Haggerty, Ph. D., Arlington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
(646) '21 Rev. Frank H. Hallock, D. D., 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill.
(923) '28 Prof. E. E. Harkness, B. D., Ph. D., Crozer Seminary, Chester, Pa.
(728) '22 Victor E. Harlow, M. A., Oklahoma City, Okla.
(119) '84 Prof. J. R. Harris, Litt. D., 210 Bristol Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, England.
(385) '05 Prof. W. H. P. Hatch, St. John's Rd., Cambridge, Mass.
(834) '26 Rev. R. S. Haupert, Moravian College and Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
(668) '22 Prof. Charles A. Hawley, Ph. D., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
(648) '21 Prof. Howell M. Haydn, B. D., 1832 Rosemont Road, East Cleveland, Ohio.
(322) '98 Rev. Henry H. Haynes, Ph. D., Derry Village, N. H.
(960) '29 Prof. George Percy Hedley, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.
(503) '13 Prof. Charles B. Hedrick, 599 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.
(124) '84 Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D., 109 E. Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
(577) '17 Prof. Ralph K. Hickok, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
(890) '27 Prof. J. H. Hicks, A. B., B. D., 3548 McFarlinAve., Dallas, Tex.
(454) '10 Prof. W. Bancroft Hill, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
(434) '08 Prof. Wm. J. Hinke, Ph. D., 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y.
(659) '21 Rev. Chas. T. Hock, 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J.
(802) '25 Rev. Ernest G. Hoff, Ph. D., 22 S. State St., Elgin, Ill.
(999) '30 Rabbi I. B. Hoffman, 134 Court St., Ithaca, N. Y.
(563) '16 Rev. Louis H. Holden, Ph. D., D.D., Theol. Sem., New Brunswick, N. J.
(836) '26 Miss Louise P. Holden, 284 Wilder St., Lowell, Mass.
(990) '30 Mr. George W. Hollister, B. D., 610 W. 115th Street, New York City.
(427) '08 Rev. Ivan L. Holt, 5068 Washington Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.
(539) '15 Prof. Lynn H. Hough, Central M. E. Church, Detroit, Mich.
(942) '25 Prof. J. Howard Howson, M. A., B. D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
(304) '96 Rt. Rev. Hiram R. Hulse, S. T. D., 15th and 8th Sts., Havana, Cuba.

(439) '08 Prof. Mary I. Hussey, Morgan Road, South Hadley, Mass.
(452) '10 Prof. Henry Hyvernat, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
(858) '26 Dean Clyo Jackson, St. Stephen's College, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
(559) '16 Prof. F. J. Foakes Jackson, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(679) '22 Prof. Fleming James, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
(891) '27 Dr. George Jeshurun, 1366 55th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(386) '05 Prof. James R. Jewett, Ph. D., 44 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(485) '12 Miss Harriet E. Johnson, 32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
(636) '21 Pres. William H. Johnson, Ph. D., D. D., Lincoln University, Pa.
(962) '29 Rabbi Leo Jung, Ph. D., 131 W. 86th St., N. Y. City.
(865) '27 Prof. M. M. Kaplan, 1 W. 89th St., New York City.
(878) '27 Rev. Francis L. Keenan, D. D., St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.
(151) '86 Prof. M. L. Kellner, D. D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(592) '20 Rev. Edwin H. Kellogg, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.
(660) '22 Prof. Fred T. Kelly, 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis.
(725) '22 Prof. Alexander P. Kelso, B. Sc., Southwestern Presb. Univ., Memphis, Tenn.
(338) '00 Pres. James A. Kelso, Ph. D., 725 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(438) '08 Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(649) '21 Rev. Paca Kennedy, D. D., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
(892) '27 Rev. Robert O. Kevin, 4221 Osage Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
(895) '27 Carl H. King, 101 Columbia Ave., Lynchburg, Va.
(908) '28 Prof. G. B. King, Wesley College, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
(852) '26 Prof. Edward H. Knight, D. D., 71 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.
(544) '15 Prof. Carl S. Knopf, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
(460) '10 Rev. Raymond C. Knox, Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(909) '28 George Alexander Kohut, 1185 Park Ave., N. Y. City.
(767) '24 Prof. Carl H. Kraeling, 2165 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(518) '14 Rev. Emil G. H. Kraeling, 531 E. 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(952) '29 Prof. Howard T. Kuist, Ph. D., 235 East 49th St., N. Y. City.
(879) '27 Robert M. Kurtz, M. A., 8 E. Westervelt Ave., Tenafly, N. J.
(473) '11 Rev. M. G. Kyle, D. D., Xenia Theol. Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
(519) '14 Prof. Elbert C. Lane, Hartford Theol. Sem., Hartford, Conn.

(880) '27 Prof. Frank G. Lankard, Drew University, Madison New Jersey.
(910) '28 Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M., 255 Montauk Ave., New London, Conn.
(743) '23 Prof. Darwin Ashley Leavitt, B. D., 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis.
(665) '21 Prof. Elmer A. Leslie, 228 Mason Terrace, Brookline, Mass.
(769) '24 Rabbi Leon Liebreich, M. A., 640 W. State St., Trenton, N. J.
(953) '29 Rev. S. A. Livingstone, M. A., 190 Summit Ave., Providence, R. I.
(622) '21 Miss Grace Lockton, 107 W. 3rd St., Frederick, Md.
(372) '04 Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, 2273 S. Fillmore St., Denver, Colo.
(674) '22 Mrs. Mary B. Longyear, 60 Leicester Ter., Brookline, Mass.
(845) '26 Rev. Arnold E. Look, Ph. D., Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass.
(991) '30 Mrs. Florence B. Lovell, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.
(944) '29 Rev. John Lowe, Trinity College, Toronto 5, Canada.
(715) '22 Prof. William J. Lowstuter, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
(720) '22 Prof. Nils W. Lund, Th. M., North Park College, Chicago, Illinois.
(590) '18 Mrs. Eugene W. Lyman, Union Theol. Sem., Broadway at 120th, N. Y. City.
(71) '82 Prof. D. G. Lyon, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass.
(324) '26 Prof. W. Vernon Lytle, Ph. D., De Pauw Univ., Greencastle, Ind.
(847) '26 Prof. S. V. McCasland, Ph. D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
(721) '22 Prof. W. H. McClellan, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
(954) '29 Dean John Dale McCormick, A. M., D. D., Kimball School, Salem, Oregon.
(536) '15 Prof. C. C. McCown, Ph. D., D. D., American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine.
(881) '27 Rev. Walter T. McCree, M. A., Streetsville, Ontario, Canada.
(319) '98 Prof. John E. McFadyen, Trinity College, Glasgow, Scotland.
(300) '96 Pres. Arthur C. McGiffert, D. D., 22 Greenough St., Newport, R. I.
(977) '30 Prof. George H. C. Macgregor, M. A., B. D., D. Litt., Hartford Theo. Sem., Hartford, Conn.
(424) '08 Prof. J. Gresham Machen, 206 S. Thirteenth St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(637) '21 Rev. Edward Mack, D. D., 4 Westwood Avenue, Richmond, Va.
(804) '25 Rev. John V. Madison, B. D., M. A., 615 Ave. C, Fort Dodge, Iowa.
(742) '23 Prof. J. R. Mantey, Th. D., 3034 W. Wash. Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(837) '26 Ralph Marcus, Ph. D., 160 Claremont Ave., N. Y. City.
(681) '22 Rabbi Elias Margolis, Ph. D., 16 Glen Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
(516) '13 Prof. Max L. Margolis, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(968) '29 Prof. Earl B. Marlatt, 9 Willow St., Boston, Mass.

(853) ’26 John Martin, Esq., North Adams, Mass.
(545) ’15 Prof. Alexander Marx, Ph. D., 531 W. 123d St., N. Y. City.
(911) ’28 Rev. Thomas B. Mather, Th. D., 419 E. Capital, Jefferson City, Mo.
(860) ’26 Prof. Takuo Matsumoto, Aoyama Gakuin Theol. Seminary, Tokyo, Japan.
(770) ’24 Charles D. Matthews, Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.
(617) ’21 Prof. I. G. Matthews, Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(846) ’26 Prof. Joseph B. Matthews, S. T. M., 383 Bible House, Astor Place, N. Y. City.
(546) ’15 Rev. John A. Maynard, Ph. D., D. D., 7149 Juno St., Forest Hills, L. I., N. Y.
(584) ’18 Prof. Théophile J. Meek, Univ. of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
(882) ’27 John H. Meengs, Th. D., 3258 Riverview, No. Park, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(771) ’24 Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph. D., D. D., Grafton, Mass.
(601) ’20 Rev. Henry H. Meyer, D. D., Ph. D., 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
(978) ’30 Prof. Nathaniel Micklem, Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
(961) ’29 Allen J. Miller, B. A., 2197 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(639) ’22 Prof. Russell B. Miller, Ph. D., Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware, Ohio.
(585) ’15 Mrs. Ruth Richards Miller, Ph. D., 50 Chetwynd Road, West Sommerville, Mass.
(475) ’11 Prof. Conrad H. Moehlmann, 333 Rockingham St., Rochester, N. Y.
(921) ’28 Prof. James Moffatt, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York City.
(838) ’26 Rev. G. Gardner Monks, B. D., Lenox School, Lenox, Mass.
(236) ’92 Prof. J. A. Montgomery, Ph. D., 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
(912) ’28 Lewis C. Moon, Morgan College, Baltimore, Md.
(979) ’30 Ellen W. Moore, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
(566) ’16 Pres. Julian Morgenstern, Ph. D., 3988 Parker Place, Cincinnati, Ohio.
(992) ’30 Rev. H. T. Morris, Th. D., Holyoke, Colorado.
(698) ’22 Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.
(331) ’99 Pres. Warren J. Moulton, Ph. D., Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(772) ’24 Prof. James Muilenberg, Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(868) ’27 W. H. Murray, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City.
(627) ’21 Prof. Thomas Kinloch Nelson, M. A., D. D., Theol. Sem., Alexandria, Va.

(508) '13 Rev. Wm. M. Nesbit, Ph. D., Watertown, Conn.
(924) '28 Mrs. Robert W. New, Giselastr. 28/II, Munich, Germany.
(806) '25 Prof. Herbert L. Newman, B. D., 2 West Court, Waterwille, Maine.
(608) '20 Rabbi Louis I. Newman, Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 83rd St. near Central Park West, N. Y. City.
(966) '26 Miss Helen R. H. Nichol, The Masters School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
(820) '24 Prof. Julian Obermann, 417 W. 114th St., New York City, N. Y.
(476) '11 Miss Ellen S. Ogden, Ph. D., Resthaven, R. F. D., Milford, Mass.
(859) '26 Miss M. Evelyn Oliver, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
(572) '16 Prof. Albert T. Olmstead, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(773) '24 Prof. Ernest W. Parsons, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.
(757) '23 Mrs. Katherine S. H. Paton, S. T. B., 359 Fern St., West Hartford, Conn.
(240) '92 Prof. L. B. Paton, Ph. D., 359 Fern St., West Hartford, Conn.
(323) '98 Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph. D., Syracuse, N. Y.
(623) '21 Prof. Alfred Morris Perry, Ph. D., Bangor Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Maine.
(611) '21 Prof. Robert H. Pfeiffer, S. M. T., Ph. D., 82 Larch Road, Cambridge, Mass.
(748) '23 Rev. ZeBarney B. Phillips, D. D., 2224 R. St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
(980) '30 Rev. P. Hewison Pollock, 417 Penn Ave. So., Minneapolis, Minn.
(958) '29 Prof. Frank K. Pool, Furman Univ., Greenville, S. C.
(378) '05 Prof. William Popper, Ph. D., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
(254) '93 Prof. F. C. Porter, D. D., 1111 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(532) '15 Prof. Thomas Porter, Ph. D., S. T. D., Rua Padre Vieira 3, Campinas, Brazil.
(822) '25 Dean H. H. Powell, 1051 Taylor St., San Francisco, Calif.
(981) '30 Randle H. Powley, A. B., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
(509) '13 Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, 86 Gillett St., Hartford, Conn.
(556) '16 Rev. Sartell Prentice, D. D., 17 E. 11th St., New York City.
(176) '87 Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Ill.
(597) '20 Prof. Alex. C. Purdy, Ph. D., Hartford Theol. Sem., Hartford, Conn.
(775) '24 C. E. Purinton, 13 Avon Place, West Hempstead, N. Y.
(701) '22 Prof. Herbert R. Purinton, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.
(653) '21 Prof. Charles Lynn Pyatt, College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.

(883) ’27 Prof. Chester Warren Quimby, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
(913) ’28 Prof. Harry Ranston, Richmond House, Trinity College, Auckland, N. Z.
(557) ’16 Pres. John H. Raven, D. D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(361) ’03 Pres. Herry L. Reed, Auburn Theol. Sem., Auburn, N. Y.
(914) ’28 Max I. Reich, 624 Crown St., Morrisville, Pa.
(848) ’26 Prof. Nathaniel Reich, P. O. Box 337, Philadelphia, Pa.
(533) ’15 Joseph Reider, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.
(982) ’30 Rev. H. N. Renfrew, B. A., S. T. M., 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. City.
(776) ’24 Rev. Hilary G. Richardson, A. B., B. D., 147 N. Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.
(777) ’24 Donald W. Riddle, Faculty Exchange, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(510) ’13 Prof. Frank H. Ridgley, Ph. D., Lincoln Univ., Chester Co., Penna.
(993) ’30 Rev. Martin Rist, Th. D., 5804 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
(815) ’25 Corwin C. Roach, Gambier, Ohio.
(455) ’10 Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D., Southern Bap. Theol. Sem., Louisville, Ky.
(884) ’27 Rev. J. B. Robertson, B. D., First Christian Church, Mexico, Mo.
(389) ’06 Prof. Benj. W. Robinson, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
(826) ’26 Miss Dorothy B. Robinson, B. D., Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(284) ’95 Prof. Geo. L. Robinson, Ph.D., 2312 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
(285) ’95 Prof. James H. Ropes, D. D., 13 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass.
(687) ’22 Rabbi William Rosenau, 1515 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md.
(897) ’27 H. H. Rowley, B. D., Rydal Mount, Pellhurst Road, Ryder, I. o. W., England.
(387) ’05 Dean Elbert Russell, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
(983) ’30 Rev. J. J. Russell, 32 Dodge St., Beverly, Mass.
(456) ’10 Prof. J. R. Sampey, LL. D., Southern Bap. Theol. Sem., Louisville, Ky.
(187) ’88 Rev. F. K. Sanders, Ph. D., Rockport, Mass.
(511) ’13 Prof. H. A. Sanders, Ph. D., Porta S. Pancrazio, Roma, Italy.
(780) ’24 Rev. J. Foster Savidge, S. T. M., Church of the Holy Communion, Norwood, N. J.
(190) ’88 Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Ph. D., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
(708) ’22 Prof. F. W. Schneider, D. D., 1504 Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa.

(669) '22 Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff, Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa.
(994) '30 Prof. Paul Schubert, Ph. D., Redfield College, Redfield, South Dakota.
(457) '10 Rev. Samuel Schulman, D. D., 27 West 72nd St., N. Y. City.
(955) '29 Prof. Paul J. Schwab, B. D., Ph. D., 211 Martha St., Waxahachie, Texas.
(463) '10 Prof. E. F. Scott, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., N. Y. City.
(956) '29 Prof. Stanley Scott, Ph. D., Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(856) '26 Prof. William Scott, Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, Va.
(807) '25 Keith C. Seele, 648 Milwaukee Ave., Elkhart, Ind.
(520) '14 Prof. Wm. G. Seiple, 125 Tsuchidoi, Sendai, Miyagi Ken, Japan.
(699) '22 Prof. Arthur G. Sellen, Ph. D., Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.
(676) '22 Prof. Ovid R. Sellers, Ph. D., 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.
(408) '07 Prof. Charles N. Shepard, Gen. Theol. Sem., Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(808) '25 A. R. Siebens, 135 Church St., Bowling Green, Ohio.
(683) '22 Mr. Benjamin Silkiner, 101 W. 113th St., New York City.
(984) '30 Rev. C. A. Simpson, 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. City.
(337) '00 Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, D.D., Drew Theol. Sem., Madison, N. J.
(849) '26 Dr. S. L. Skoss, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(946) '29 Rev. David K. Sloatman, B. A., B. D., 75 Fourth St., New Haven, Conn.
(841) '26 Prof. W. Aiken Smart, D. D., Emory University, Ga.
(786) '24 Rev. H. Framer Smith, M. A., B. D., 913 Washington St., Evanston, Ill.
(409) '07 Prof. John M. P. Smith, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(548) '15 Miss Louise P. Smith, Wellesley College, Wellesley 81, Mass.
(603) '20 Prof. Robert Seneca Smith, 1157 Yale St., New Haven, Conn.
(580) '17 Rev. J. Edward Snyder, 12649 S. Western Ave., Blue Island, Ill.
(787) '24 Ephraim A. Speiser, Ph. D., University of Penns., Philadelphia, Pa.
(863) '26 Prof. R. T. Stamm, 123 Springs Ave., Gettysburg, Pa.
(995) '30 Mr. Joshua Starr, Ph. B., 13 Nathan Davis Place, New York City, N. Y.
(328) '99 Prof. Wallace N. Stearns, Ph. D., Jacksonville, Ill.
(738) '23 Rev. Ferris J. Stephens, Ph. D., Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven, Conn.
(567) '16 Prof. Paul R. Stevick, Ozark Wesleyan College, Carthage, Mo.
(716) '22 Prof. Harris B. Stewart, 15 Seminary St., Auburn, N. Y.
(915) '28 William B. Stimson, 1920 Panama St., Philadelphia, Pa.

(886) '27 Edward C. Stone, 40 Allen Place, Hartford, Conn.
(916) '28 Miss Pearle F. Stone, Ashley, Ohio.
(917) '28 Rev. Ronald J. Tamblyn, B. D., 211 Hendrix St., Greensboro, N. C.
(918) '28 George S. Tarry, B. S., 2213 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.
(894) '27 Rev. Charles L. Taylor, Jr., Th. M., 6 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Mass.
(810) '25 Prof. W. R. Taylor, Ph. D., University College, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
(919) '28 Prof. Chaim Tchernowitz, Ph. D., 640 West 139th St., New York City, N. Y.
(851) '26 Rabbi Sidney S. Tedesche, Ph. D., 17 E. Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y.
(691) '22 Rev. Patrick J. Temple, S. T. D., 104 Mount Joy Place, New Rochelle, N. Y.
(111) '84 Rev. Roderick Terry, D. D., Newport, R. I.
(342) '00 Rev. Charles S. Thayer, Ph. D., 4 Gillette St., Hartford, Conn.
(813) '25 Prof. David E. Thomas, Ph. D., 804 Virginia Ave., Columbia, Mo.
(859) '29 Rev. M. H. Throop, St. John's Univ., Shanghai. China.
(695) '22 Rev. Edward K. Thurlow, S. T. M., Sheffield, Mass.
(257) '93 Prof. C. C. Torrey, D. D., 191 Bishop St., New Haven, Conn.
(781) '24 P. Raffaele Tramontano, College S. Luigi, Posilipo, Naples, Italy.
(996) '30 Prof. Daniel Curtis Troxel, College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.
(480) '11 Prof. Harold H. Tryon, Union Theol Sem., N. Y. City.
(920) '28 Rev. Morris H. Turk, Ph. D., D. D., 17 West St., Portland, Maine.
(948) '29 Rev. Dudley Tyng, Barrington, R. I.
(492) '12 Prof. J. Milton Vance, 930 N. Bever St., Wooster, O.
(706) '22 Rev. Selby Frame Vance, D. D., LL. D., 237 Hilands Ave., Ben Avon, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(549) '15 Rev. Prof. A. A. Vaschalde. Ph. D., Catholic. Univ., Washington, D. C.
(663) '22 Prof. E. E. Voigt, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
(713) '22 Rev. R. B. Wallace, D. D., 833 E. Rittenhouse St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(957) '29 Donald C. Ward, B. A., B. D., New Salem, Pa.
(791) '24 Prof. O. W. Warmingham, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
(521) '14 Prof. LeRoy Waterman, 1835 Vinewood Bvd., Ann Arbor, Mich.
(949) '29 Prof. Paul C. Warren, 207 W. 107 th. St., N. Y., City.
(812) '25 Prof. Orville E. Watson, D. D., Bexley Hall, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
(657) '21 Prof. W. G. Watson, B. D., 40 Francklyn St., Halifax, N. S. Canada.

(643) '21 Dean Thomas Wearing, Ph. D., 263 Canterbury Road, Rochester, N. Y.
(658) '21 Rev. J. H. Webster, D. D., 5738 Clemens Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
(667) '22 Prof. Gordon B. Wellman, Th. D., 17 Midland Road, Wellesley 81 Mass.
(689) '22 Pres. W. W. White, Ph. D., D. D., 235 East 49 th Street, New York, New York.
(445) '09 Prof. Edward A. Wicher, D. D., San Francisco Theol. Sem., San Anselmo, Cal.
(726) '22 Rev. Dean Rockwell Wickes, American Board Mission, Lintsing, Sung., China.
(535) '15 Prof. Laura H. Wild, Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(997) '30 Mr. Amos Niven Wilder, B. A., B. D., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
(684) '22 Prof. Clyde E. Wildman, 238 Kensington Place, Syracuse, N. Y.
(696) '22 Chas. B. Williams, Ph. D., D. D., Union Univ., Jackson, Tenn.
(900) '27 Prof. Edward O. Williams, B. Th., A. M., 340 W. 55th St., N. Y. City.
(275) '95 Rev. Leighton Williams, Marlborough, N. Y.
(790) '24 H. R. Willoughby, 139 Goodspeed Hall, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(985) '30 W. J. Wilson, Th. D., Study 9, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.
(788) '24 Pres. S. S. Wise, Ph. D., LL. D., Jewish Institute of Religion, W. 68th St., N. Y. City.
(672) '22 Rev. J. E. Wishart, D. D., San Francisco Theol. Sem., San Anselmo, Calif.
(782) '24 Prof. H. A. Wolfson, 85 Prescott St., Cambridge, Mass.
(630) '21 Rev. Clinton T. Wood, M. A., 912 North Bever St., Wooster, Ohio.
(272) '94 Prof. Irving F. Wood, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
(497) '12 Prof. W. C. Wood, Ph. D., College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.
(644) '21 Prof. William H. Wood, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
(842) '26 Rev. Prof. Edw. Strong Worcester, D. D., Theol. Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(697) '22 Pres. William L. Worcester, 5 Bryant St., Cambridge, Mass.
(625) '21 Prof. M. J. Wyngarden, Ph. D., c/o Calvin College Library, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(412) '07 Rev. Royden K. Yerkes, Ph. D., D. D., 42nd & Locust Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(538) '15 Prof. Harry C. York, Ph. D., 602 W. Washington Ave., Elmira, N. Y.
(610) '20 Prof. Solomon Zeitlin, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS

WHICH SUBSCRIBE FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY

American Library in Paris	10 Rue de L'Elysée (8). Paris, France.
American School of Oriental Research,	Jerusalem, Palestine.
Amherst College Library,	Amherst, Mass.
Andover Harvard Theological Library,	Cambridge, Mass.
Auburn Theological Seminary,	Auburn, N. Y.
Bangor Theological Seminary,	Bangor, Me.
Beloit College Library,	Beloit, Wisconsin.
Berkeley Baptist Divinity School,	Berkeley, Calif.
Bodleian Library,	Oxford, England.
Boston University Library,	Boston, Mass.
Bowdoin College Library,	Brunswick, Me.
Brown University Library,	Providence, R. I.
Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Bucknell Library,	Chester, Pa.
Butler College Library,	Indianapolis, Ind.
Carnegie Free Library of Allegheny, Federal and Ohio Sts. N. S.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carnegie Library,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School,	Rochester, N. Y.
Columbia Theological Seminary,	Decatur, Ga.
Columbia University Library,	N. Y. City.
Congregational Library,	Boston, Mass.
Cornell University Library,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Divinity Hall, 740 University St.,	Montreal, Canada.
Divinity School Library, 42nd & Locust Streets	Philadelphia, Pa.
Doshisha Theological School,	Kyto, Japan.
Drew Theological Seminary Library,	Madison, N. J.
Duke University Library,	Durham, N. C.
Eden Theological Seminary Library,	Webster Groves, Mo.
Emory University Library,	Georgia.
Enoch Pratt Free Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Free Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Gardner and Sage Library	New Brunswick, N. J.
Garrett Biblical Institute Library,	Evanston, Ill.
General Theological Seminary,	N. Y. City.
Gettysburg Theological Seminary,	Gettysburg, Pa.
Goucher College Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Haverford College Library,	Haverford, Pa.

Hiram College Library,	Hiram, Ohio.
James Milliken University,	Decatur, Ill.
Jewish Institute of Religion,	West 68th St., N. Y. City.
John Rylands Library.	Manchester, England.
Johns Hopkins University Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Library, International Y. M. C. A. College,	Springfield, Mass.
Library of Congress,	Washington, D. C.
Libreria de Augustin Bosch, 5 Ronda de la Universidad,	Barcelona, Spain.
Main Library, 8th and Grande Ave.,	Milwaukee, Wis.
Margaret Carnegie Library,	Mills College, Calif.
Mount Holyoke College Library,	South Hadley, Mass.
Mt. St. Mary's Seminary,	Norwood, Ohio.
Newberry Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Newton Theol. Institution Library,	Newton Centre 39, Mass.
Northwestern University Library,	Evanston, Ill.
Oberlin College Library,	Oberlin, Ohio.
Ohio State University Library,	Columbus, Ohio.
Pacific School of Religion,	Berkeley, Cal.
Pacific Unitarian School, Dana and Allston Way,	Berkeley, Calif.
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 616 W. North Ave.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Princeton Theological Seminary Library,	Princeton, N. J.
Public Library,	Boston, Mass.
Public Library, 197 Montague St.,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Public Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Public Library,	Cleveland, Ohio.
Public Library,	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Public Library,	Jersey City, N. J.
Public Library,	Los Angeles, Calif.
Public Library,	New York, N. Y.
Public Library,	St. Louis, Mo.
Public Library of Victoria,	Melbourne, Australia.
Queen's University,	Kingston, Ontario, Can.
Rochester Theological Seminary Library,	Rochester, N. Y.
San Francisco Theological Seminary Library,	San Anselmo, Calif.
Scarritt College for Christian Workers Library,	Nashville, Tenn.

Shantung Christian Univ., Tsinan	Shantung, China.
Smith College Library,	Northampton, Mass.
State Library,	Albany, N. Y.
State Library,	Concord, N. H.
State Library,	Lansing, Mich.
State Library,	Sacramento, Cal.
St. Mary's Mission Library,	Techny, Ill.
Sun Yatsen Library,	Tungshan, China.
Syracuse University Library,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Theological School in Harvard University,	Cambridge, Mass.
Union College of B. C. Library,	Vancouver, B. C.
Union Theological Seminary Library,	N. Y. City.
University Library,	Cambridge, England.
University of California,	Berkeley, Calif.
University of Dubuque,	Dubuque, Iowa.
University of Illinois,	Urbana, Ill.
University of Michigan Library,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
University of Minnesota Library,	Minneapolis, Minn.
University of Pennsylvania Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
University of Southern California,	Los Angeles, Calif.
University of Wisconsin Library,	Madison, Wis.
Vail Memorial Library, Lincoln University	Lincoln University P. O., Pa.
Vassar College Library,	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Wellesley College Library,	Wellesley, Mass.
Wesleyan University Library,	Middletown, Conn.
Western State Teacher's College,	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Western Theological Seminary, Ridge Ave.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dr. Williams' Library,	London, W.C., 1, England
John Gordon Wright Library,	Cambridge, Mass.
Zion Research Foundation Library,	Brookline, Mass.

LIST OF EXCHANGES

(To be sent to Journal of Biblical Literature, Drawer 8, Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut, and ultimately to go to the American School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.)

Anglican Theological Review	2145 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Illinois.

Archiv für Orientforschung,	Babelsberger Str. 48, Berlin-Wilmersdorf.
Biblica,	Istituto Biblico Pontifico, Piazza Pilotta 35, Roma I., Italy.
Biblioteca Vaticana,	Vaticano, Rome, Italy.
Canadian Journal of Religious Thought,	73 Queens Park, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
Crozer Quarterly,	Chester, Pennsylvania.
Expository Times,	Edinburgh, Scotland.
Jewish Quarterly Review,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Journal of Religion, Univ. of Chicago,	Chicago, Illinois.
Journal of Theological Studies,	London, England.
Kalich,	Hus Theological Faculty, Prague I, Klementinum, Czecho-Slovakia.
Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift,	Haarlem, Holland.
Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft,	Berlin C 2, Schloß, Portal 3.
Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Review and Expositor	Louisville, Kentucky.
Revue Biblique Internationale,	90 Rue Bonaparte, Paris, France.
Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Réligieuses,	Care Prof. Ménégoz, Palais de l'Université, Strasbourg, France.
Theologie der Gegenwart,	Leipzig, Germany.
Theologische Literaturzeitung,	Leipzig, Germany.
Theologische Studien und Kritiken,	Gotha, Germany.
Theologisches Literaturblatt,	Leipzig, Germany.
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,	Göttingen, Nikolausbergerweg 53, Germany.
Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,	Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Berliner Straße 65.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

(As Amended Dec. 28, 1901 and Dec. 28, 1923)

CONSTITUTION

I

This association shall be called "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis."

II

The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on Biblical topics.

III

The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who, with five others, shall be united in a Council. These shall be elected annually by the Society, with the exception of the Corresponding Secretary, who shall be elected annually by the Council. Additional members of the Council shall be the Presidents of the Sections hereinafter provided for. There shall be also a Publishing Committee, consisting of the Corresponding Secretary and two others, who shall be annually chosen by the Council.

IV

Members shall be elected by the Society upon the recommendation of the Council. They may be of two classes, active and honorary. Honorary members shall belong to other nationalities than that of the United States of America, and shall be especially distinguished for their attainments as Biblical scholars. The number of honorary members chosen at the first election shall be not more than ten; in any succeeding year not more than two.

V

The Society shall meet at least once a year, at such time and place as the Council may determine. On the first day of the annual meeting the President, or some other member appointed by the Council for the purpose, shall deliver an address to the Society.

VI

Sections, consisting of all the members of the Society residing in a particular locality, may be organized, with the consent of the Council for the object stated in Article II, provided that the number of members composing any Section shall not be less than twelve. Each Section shall annually choose for itself a President, whose duty it shall be to preside over its meeting, and to take care that such papers and notes read before it as the Section may judge to be of sufficient value are transmitted promptly to the Corresponding Secretary of the Society. The Sections shall meet as often as they shall severally determine, provided that their meetings do not interfere with the meetings of the Society.

VII

This constitution may be amended by a vote of the Society, on recommendation of the Council, such amendment having been proposed at a previous meeting, and notice of the same having been sent to the members of the Society.

BY-LAWS

I

It shall be the duty of the President, or, in his absence, of the Vice-President, to preside at all the meetings of the Society; but, in the absence of both these officers, the Society may choose a presiding officer from the members present.

II

It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to notify the members, at least two weeks in advance, of each meeting, transmitting to them at the same time the list of papers to be presented at the meeting; to keep a record of the proceedings of such meetings; to preserve an accurate roll of the members; to make an annual report of the condition of the Society; to distribute its publications, and to do such other like things as the Council may request.

III

It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretary to conduct the correspondence of the Society, and in particular, to use his best efforts for the securing of suitable papers and notes to be presented to the Society at each meeting; to prepare a list of such papers, and to place it in the hands of the Recording Secretary for transmission to the members; to receive all papers and notes that shall have been presented, and lay them before the Publishing Committee.

IV

It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to take charge of all the funds of the Society, and to invest or disburse them under the direction of the Council, rendering an account of all his transactions to the Society at each annual meeting.

V

It shall be the duty of the Council to propose candidates for membership of the Society; to elect the Corresponding Secretary and the additional members of the Publishing Committee; to fix the times and places for meetings, and generally to supervise the interests of the Society.

VI

It shall be the duty of the Publishing Committee to publish the proceedings of the Society, and also to select, edit, and publish, as far as the funds of the Society will justify, such papers and notes from among those laid before them, as shall in their judgment be fitted to promote Biblical science.

VII

Each member shall annually pay a tax of three dollars. The donation at one time, by a single person, of fifty dollars shall exempt the donor from all further payments, and no payments shall be required of honorary members.

VIII

Each member shall be entitled to receive, without additional charge one copy of each publication of the Society after his election; in addition to which, if he be a contributor to the *Journal*, he shall receive twenty-five copies of any article or articles he may have contributed.

IX

Five members of the Council, of whom not less than three shall have been elected directly by the Society, shall constitute a quorum thereof. Twelve members of the Society shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may continue in session for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

The following resolution, supplementary to the By-Laws, with reference to the price at which members may procure extra copies of the *Journal*, was adopted June 13th, 1884.

Resolved: That the Secretary be authorized to furnish to members, *for the purpose of presentation*, additional copies of any volume of the *Journal*, to the number of ten, at the rate of $ 1 a copy, but that the price to persons not members be the amount of the annual assessment.

231

United Theological Seminary Library

DEMCO

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room